

THE CHICAGO JEWISH FORUM

A National Quarterly Magazine

VOLUME 6, No. 2

WINTER, 1947-1948



Contents

GROUP LIBEL AND THE LAW	- - - - -	Robert L. Weinberg	85
EDUCATION IN A MELTING POT	- - - - -	Morris Freedman	91
REFUGEE SHIP— <i>A Poem</i>	- - - - -	Eleanor Alletta Chaffee	94
THE JEWISH WRITER AND AMERICAN LITERATURE	- -	Charles I. Glicksberg	95
CATHOLICISM IN AMERICAN LIFE	- - - - -	Heinz Eulau	101
A YOUNG GIRL— <i>Wood Sculpture</i>	- - - - -	Berel Satt	107
YIVO—A CULTURAL FORCE	- - - - -	Marshall Sklare	108
WOMAN IN SUBWAY— <i>An Etching</i>	- - - - -	Joshua Z. Holland	111
A BOY FROM GERMANY— <i>A Short Story</i>	- - - - -	Benjamin Weintraub	112
EASY DOES IT	- - - - -	Maxwell H. Goldberg	115
GENTLEMEN, THIS IS MY SPEECH:	- - - - -	Selwyn S. Schwartz	120
MIDWESTERN COMMENTARY	- - - - -	Elmer Gertz	121
A FRIENDLY GAME— <i>From a Lithograph</i>	- - - - -	Joshua Z. Holland	124
NEW YORK NOTES	- - - - -	Vero	125
WASHINGTON NOTES	- - - - -	Murray Frank	130
WEST COAST LETTER	- - - - -	Carey McWilliams	136
LIBERATION CYPRESS— <i>A Block Print</i>	- - - - -	Leon Gordon Miller	140
BOOK REVIEWS	- - - - -		141-154

BENJAMIN WEINTROUB, *Editor and Publisher*

ALFRED WERNER, *Associate Editor*

THE CHICAGO JEWISH FORUM is published quarterly at 82 W. Washington St., Chicago 2, Ill. Copyright, 1947, in the U.S.A. by Benjamin Weintraub, Publisher. Entered as second-class matter Jan. 19, 1943, at the post-office at Chicago, Ill., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by stamped, self-addressed envelope. Subscription: \$5.00 per year.

Contributors to this Issue

WERNER J. CAHNMAN—Formerly with Fisk University is a frequent writer on sociological subjects.

ELY CHINYOY—Is completing work for a Ph. D. in the Department of Sociology at Columbia University.

HEINZ EULAU—Formerly associate editor of the *New Republic*, at present teaches American Government and Administration at Antioch College.

EDWARD FALKOWSKI—Former managing editor of the New York bureau of the Polish Press Agency, is a contributor to various periodicals.

MORRIS FREEDMAN—Teaches English at the City College of New York. His articles have appeared in *Liberty*, *The New Republic*, *The Toronto Star Weekly*, *The American Weekly*, *Commentary* and other publications.

CHARLES I. GLICKSBERG—Is assistant professor of English at Brooklyn College, N. Y., and the author of *Walt Whitman and the Civil War*.

MAXWELL H. GOLDBERG—Is professor of English at the University of Massachusetts and a lecturer and writer on educational subjects.

CARL GRABO—Noted Shelley scholar is the author of *The Technique of the Novel* and *The Art of the Short Story*. His new book *The Creative Critic* will soon be published by the University of Chicago Press.

MORRIS A. GUTSTEIN—Is Rabbi of the North Park Congregation in Chicago, and the author of *Aaron Lopez and Judah Touro*.

JOSHUA Z. HOLLAND—A major after four years with American Air Forces in the last war, is a Chicago artist who has exhibited in a number of art museums.

ALFRED J. HOTZ—Is an instructor in the Department of Political Science, University of Chicago. He is currently writing his doctoral dissertation on American Liberalism In World Affairs Since World War I.

KATHERINE KORNBLAU—Published a story in the Winter 1944-45 issue "Make Thy Face Clear Before Mine Eyes." She's a free-lance writer.

IRVING LEVITAS—Is Executive Director of Education at the Jewish Center Association, Kansas City, Missouri.

CAREY MCWILLIAMS—Is west coast correspondent of *THE CHICAGO JEWISH FORUM*. A word about him appears elsewhere in this issue.

LEON G. MILLER—Is a Cleveland artist whose works are in the permanent collections of several museums. He is also the head of an industrial design firm.

GEORGE H. PARKINSON—Is managing editor of the *Christian Advocate*.

LIONEL RUBY—Professor of Philosophy at Indiana University, has recently completed a book on logic.

BEREL SATT—Lives in Los Angeles, California: he is a noted sculptor in wood, widely known for his Jewish subjects. A portfolio of his works "A Jewish Town in Wood Sculpture" has been recently published.

SELWYN S. SCHWARTZ—Has contributed poetry to *Voices*, *Sewanee Review* and *The Poetry Magazine*. He is the author of several books of poetry.

ISAAC B. SHAPIRO—Is a member of the Chicago bar.

MARSHALL SKLARE—Is director of educational activities at Chicago's Temple Emanuel.

ROBERT L. WEINBERG—Is a senior student at Maryland Law School in Baltimore.

F. C. WEISKOPF—Born in Prague, has written a number of essays, novels, and novelettes.

HARVEY WISH—Is professor of American Intellectual History at Adalbert College, Western Reserve University.

Group Libel and the Law*

By ROBERT L. WEINBERG

THE LEGAL—even moral—dilemma which this problem presents presupposes a continuation of the existing constitutional provisions regarding unfettered expression free from civil and criminal liability. Any solution which this paper may suggest will necessarily be confined to acts not expressly prohibited within the framework of our republican government. That a solution to this particular problem could be found by constitutional amendment at the sacrifice of other rights is not doubted; but such action is not to be advocated because it is felt that the loss may be greater than the gain. For better or for worse—and it is beyond the scope of this paper to argue which—we are subject to a constitution which guarantees the right of any person to say or write in the nature of opinion more or less what he will without being denied that right by congressional or state legislative action. The theoretical value of such freedom of expression is that “the rights of the best men are secure only as the rights of the vilest and most abhorrent are protected,” a proposition reaffirmed by Pound, Holmes, and Brandeis in their judicial opinions.

Like many another moral or cultural idea, freedom is a relative concept. A freedom which we take for granted today was a much sought for goal yesterday. As an illustration, consider our right of suffrage, the concept underlying our form of government. Yet we know that there was a time when such a right would have been laughed at—in the England of the

Middle Ages the people were always the governed, never the governing. And not so long ago, and even under our own Constitution, the right of suffrage was denied to many of the groups that exercise it now. Maryland denied the Jew the right to vote or hold public office until about 1825, and New York had similar restrictions; Catholics did not have the privilege until a late date in many of the states. It is only in recent years that the right was granted to women, and Negroes are still fighting for that unqualified right all over the country. As expressed by Holmes in his “Collected Legal Papers”:

We do not realize how large a part of our law is open to reconsideration upon a slight change in the habit of the public mind. No concrete proposition is self-evident, no matter how ready we may be to accept it, not even Mr. Herbert Spencer's ‘Every man has a right to do what he wills, provided he interferes not with a like right on the part of his neighbors’”. . . There is a half concealed, half conscious battle on the question of legislative policy, and if any one thinks that it can be settled deductively, or once for all, I only can say that I think he is theoretically wrong, and that I am certain that his conclusion will not be accepted in practice *semper ubique et ab omnibus*.

We struggle for what we believe is right at the time, and the radical idea of today is the precursor of the accepted doctrine of another era.

When the freedoms of the present are under observation, there arises the new consideration of testing and balancing those freedoms, one against the other. Just as these concepts vary from era to era in the life of the world, so they vary between individuals and states at any one given period of time. Reaching the proper balance at such time is really the problem which is attacked here.

*One of the prize-winning essays in a nationwide Essay Contest, among law schools in the United States, promoted by the Decalogue Society of Lawyers, an Illinois organization of 1400 lawyers of Jewish faith.

Even when some sort of agreement is reached on which freedoms shall exist and which shall not, there remains the further problem of deciding the degree to which each shall be observed. For instance, we believe today in freedom of religious worship and at the same time we insist on subservience to our national interests. Which is the stronger? Numerous cases have reached the Supreme Court in recent years in which this conflict was at issue. And the overall moral to be derived from the discordant decisions is that the degree of conformity is what counts. In the case of *United States v. Schwimmer*, 279 U. S. 644, (1929), the Court denied citizenship to a woman fifty years of age, because she asserted that she would not bear arms for this country, although her other conduct showed beyond any doubt her conviction as to the truth of our form of government. It was pointed out in the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Holmes that this woman was denied the privilege she sought simply because she believed in "the Sermon on the Mount more than we do."

Another type of balancing is evident in the case of *Cox v. New Hampshire*, 313 U. S. 569 (1941), where the Court unanimously held that a statute requiring a license for the holding of a parade interfered neither with free speech nor with freedom of religion. In the opinion, Chief Justice Hughes said: "Civil liberties, as guaranteed by the Constitution, imply the existence of an organized society maintaining *public order* without which liberty itself would be lost in the excess of unrestrained abuses." (*Italics added.*) The balancing evident in these two cases, that of patriotism v. freedom in the former, and public order v. freedom in the latter, are instances of the types of conflict which one meets in seeking a solution which will curtail absolute freedom in order to protect a minority, or to protect the community from violence or abuse.

The interpretations of the First Amendment to the Constitution are the sign-

posts which the Supreme Court has erected along the road which we must travel. Since this amendment is the one expressly granting the rights which we are seeking to "curtail," and the one which, when supplemented by the Fourteenth Amendment, applies to the States as well as to the national government, a summary of its effect will not be out of order. The combined holdings of the Court have been stated by Osmond K. Fraenkel in his book "Our Civil Liberties," and we can accept his conclusions in lieu of a detailed review here. Fraenkel contends that essentially the Court has said, concerning the First Amendment, that Congress may not interfere with religious beliefs; but it may prohibit religious practices deemed harmful to society, such as polygamy among the Mormons. Congress may punish utterances if there is a "clear and present danger" that they will result in action harmful to the country. But with respect to freedom of the press, neither Congress nor the states may censor publications in advance except for obscenity, and Congress may deny mailing privileges to printed matter deemed harmful. To whom such matter is deemed harmful is thus far a vague test, a matter to be discussed.

What, then, may we deduce from these principles with regard to the privilege of free speech and press in libeling a group or class of the population? It is the contention of the writer of this paper that since we have as yet no square ruling from the Supreme Court on how a minority may effectively and legally fight the abuse it receives at the hands of energetic bigots, any one of a number of steps could be taken. Almost all have been tried in some small degree; none has been successful to any real extent. These steps have been discussed as dicta in several Court decisions, which only raises the old discussion about whether the law follows what the judge says or what he does. Assuming for the present that the law is based on what the judges have said,

we can review the legality and feasibility of some of the proposed considerations. Most, if not all of the decisions concerning any one of the freedoms guaranteed by the First Amendment, have discussed the harm or danger accruing to the State from the practices sought to be punished, curtailed, relieved, or prevented. Nowhere has there been any extended discussion of the danger to any group which goes to make up the State, except in non-judicial writings; and that, in effect, is what we are searching for in the problem before us. The closest that the learned judges have come is the expression that anti-group libel legislation is permissible if it is confined to measures against inciting to violence or against acts which constitute an imminent danger of a breach of peace. The previously mentioned "clear and present danger" rule is the outstanding manifestation of that feeling.

Four methods are usually discussed by judges and others for curbing the practice of inciting hatred and abuse:

1. The exercise of police power.
2. The use of counter-argument and propaganda.
3. Legislation by the States.
4. The contract theory.

Each will be discussed in turn with regard to its apparent usefulness in attacking the problem.

The exercise of the police power has been resorted to in many varying circumstances, some of which have been successful; but only from the standpoint of immediate results achieved. Generally such measures have been in the form of a preventive or curtailing action by a mayor or governor in the matter of a public meeting or breach of the peace. The danger of such a method of protecting a minority lies in the abuse of the power of discretion employed by such executive and its execution by his subordinates. Two examples will suffice: (1) In Boston the mayor has prevented Ku Klux Klan meetings by the simple expedient of de-

claring the building to be used unsafe for public assembly, while permitting his own political party to hold a rally the same week at the same place. (2) The governor of Tennessee last year sent troops to quell an alleged Negro disturbance in Columbia and the troops violated almost every right guaranteed to the Negroes under the Bill of Rights.

The use of counter-propaganda is not a legal weapon within the contemplation of this pamphlet. But since it is the most widely advocated method of protecting minorities, it cannot be overlooked. The arguments for its use are always based on the theory that to protect and maintain the constitutional freedoms, those freedoms must be guaranteed to the undeserving as well as to the deserving. The convincing language used by Holmes, Brandeis, Pound, John Stuart Mill, Fraenkel, Arthur Garfield Hays, and others, is not surpassed for simplicity and clarity by these words of Chafee on page 528 of his "Free Speech in America":

Intolerance can always find some crevice in the administration of the law through which to creep to accomplish its purpose. The only remedy is to build up every day and every hour the opposite spirit, a firm faith that all varieties and shades of opinion must be given a chance to be heard, that the decision between truth and error cannot be made by human beings, but only by time and the test of open argument and counter-argument, so that each citizen may judge for himself.

Hays has likened free speech to a boiling pot: the lid on and there is likely to be an explosion. Holmes has said that noxious ideas are like champagne: expose them to the air and they fall flat. If there is any effective refutation of this argument, it is that an individual or a minority cannot wait for the passage of time to find out if the experiment of democracy is to give him the protection he needs now. Long before "each citizen may judge for himself," the words of Charles Coughlin and Gerald L. K. Smith may have aroused among the ignorant a desire for action resulting in untold damage.

The third method which has been used is that of legislation by the States. Statutes have been passed, and sometimes found to be constitutional, under the "clear and present danger" doctrine; but in the main they have been too vague and uncertain of application and interpretation by the Supreme Court to have achieved any permanent results. One notable instance of such legislation was a New Jersey statute enacted in 1939. It was entitled "An Act concerning propaganda inciting race, color, or religious hatred." The Act had an interesting preamble, asserting that its purpose was to assure "freedom of conscience in the matter of religious worship, and also equality in the protection of life, liberty and property, for the establishment of justice, insuring of domestic tranquility, promotion of the general welfare and securing the blessings of liberty." The only case which arose under it reached the Supreme Court of New Jersey where it was held that the demurrer to the indictment should have been sustained on the ground that the act violated the New Jersey and Federal constitutions. (See *State v. Klapprott*, 127 N.J.L. 395.) Where such statutes have been approved, it has usually been done on the ground that an emergency said to be then existing justifies suppression of the constitutional guarantees of freedom of expression. In some cases the Court has gone on to find that no justifying emergency has existed because there was no immediate danger from the practices proceeded against; and in others the Court has stated the general rule and upheld the statute without looking behind the conditions to see if such emergency did in fact exist in that jurisdiction or not. That there has been no consistent ground of decision is evident; that a prediction of the outcome of each has been useless is proved. In the light of Holmes's "The prophecies of what the courts will do in fact, and nothing more pretentious, are what I mean by the law," there is no one

rule to be followed in drafting future legislation to protect against violence or imminent danger.

The fourth theory has been alluded to but never seriously applied or attempted. The contract idea has a certain fascination from the standpoint of legality and legal theory, but its application is thus far only in the realm of conjecture. This idea is based on the concept that a contract exists between the government and the individual, for the enforcement of which the individual may bring an action so that the government will be forced to protect him. The contract is said to be a bilateral agreement wherein the individual covenants to give allegiance to the nation and bear arms during war in consideration for protection during peacetime. This theory was mentioned in *Luria v. United States*, 231 U.S. 9, (1913), but its application remains ambiguous.

In an interesting article in a recent issue of the *Harvard Law Review*, Chafee discusses remedies for errors in the press, radio, or films which present statements regarded as untrue. He points out that France and Germany have methods of providing for retraction of such errors, and then discusses other possible remedies, referring to the problem of group libel only briefly. It is his use of the term "group libel" that has been adopted here. Chafee dismisses legislation as being ineffective and harmful.

Underlying all of these theories except the second is the common theme of fear and punishment. But in such reasoning there appears a fallacy: punishment itself is an evil to be used only insofar as it prevents some greater evil. The general object sought here is the total happiness of the community; if the community cannot derive some benefit from the punishment proposed, then it is useless.

The error in the reasoning of the "clear and present danger" rule lies in its very application. If some preventive or punishing measure is not to be taken until an

immediate danger is manifested in the conduct sought to be prevented or punished, then the cause of action will arise simultaneously with the resulting harm. This in itself should argue for some more clear and effective test upon which measures may be taken to protect the community from the resulting violence.

Thus far we have seen what cannot be done to solve the dilemma, what should not be done, and what has been done without producing the desired effect. What rule or test may we deduce in order to satisfy ourselves with some practicable remedy for future use and experimentation?

We have seen that the problem must be handled with due regard for the two aspects of the freedoms with which we are concerned here. (1) As Holmes said, "law is open to reconsideration upon a slight change in the habit of the public mind." When the necessities of the day require a change, the law must be equal to the demand. (2) When such changes are made, there must be a balancing of the interests of each freedom in order to achieve the moral desideratum of the moment. Both of these characteristics of the freedoms guaranteed in the First Amendment have necessarily been a part of the "half concealed, half conscious battle on the question of legislative policy" as well as judicial policy. The clearest example of this are the cases arising immediately after the First World War, when there was a fear that the doctrines of the Russian Revolution would spread to this country. Compare the Schenck, Debs, Abrams, Gitlow, and Whitney cases of the early 1920's, with the Herndon, Taylor, Bridges, and Barnette cases of the 1930's. The former were severe blows to the devotees of civil liberties, whereas the latter have established a new record for unbridled non-conformity.

Similarly, the needs of today require a revision in thinking. The people and the Court must adopt limitations more in keeping with the dangers which beset

the country and which threaten the existence of harmony and understanding between the various minorities which make up the whole of this nation. The proposition that all varieties and shades of opinion must be given the unrestrained right to spread their gospel of hate, must give way to a balancing of the interests of the freedoms concerned: the heavier side of the scale will dictate the next step according to our present needs. As expressed by Mr. Justice Frankfurter in the dissent in the Barnette case, "One who is a member of the most vilified and persecuted minority in history cannot be insensitive to the constitutional guarantees of freedom." And then the Justice pointed out that despite that realization, a freedom must be denied when it conflicts with national interests. For instance, when the problem at hand concerns the defamation of a religious group, the conditions of today dictate that the necessity for protecting freedom of religion in order to preserve an harmonious community, should outweigh any necessity for the uncurbed freedom of speech which encourages and inspires violence. With great deference to Professor Chafee, this writer believes that within the limitations of the constitution we must establish new legislation, either state or federal, the object of which should be to terminate group defamation and incitement to hatred, violence, and abuse.

Possibly such legislation could be drafted on a basis similar to the New Jersey statute mentioned above; its unconstitutionality cannot be presumed on the basis of the views of one state court, which was forced to cite a doubtful Supreme Court decision in order to uphold its contention. The proposed law could prohibit "speeches, acts, writings or any other communication of ideas whose purpose or effect is to incite hatred because of race, color or religion." It could punish criminally any person aiding or abetting such communication of ideas through supplying buildings for public speeches, ma-

terials for printing or broadcasting or any other manner of publication.

But what of the legality of this proposal? Will not such a provision be a law "abridging the freedom of speech or of the press?" The answer lies in the unquestioned limitations placed on the meaning of the First Amendment all through its history of interpretation. Absolute freedom of speech has always been abridged of necessity: citizens do not have the right to incite to violence, advise murder, or yell "fire" in a theater. These restraints are now accepted without question. The ones which we propose here may be accepted with equal certainty in years hence. The Supreme Court has again and again repeated that "time has upset many fighting faiths" on the basis of "reasonable apprehension to organized government." Our only quarrel with this view is that it stops at the very point where it tends to be effective. The only difference in the present proposal and the past holdings lies in an extension of the principles already recognized in the interpretation of the skeleton words of the Bill of Rights.

If any doubt be still existing in regard to the legality of such an extension, an analogy may be made to one of the now famous and undoubted decisions of the early days of the Supreme Court. The case of *McCulloch v. Maryland*, 4 Wheaton 316, established the proposition that when a constitutional or legislative grant is made, it carries with it such implied powers as may be necessary to make available and carry into effect the granted powers or rights, and must therefore be presumed to have been within the intention of the express grant. Applying that principle to the provisions with which we have been dealing, it means that the people granted a minority not only the right to worship as it pleased, as an end to be desired; but, necessarily, they granted also the power to protect and enforce that right as means to the consti-

tutional end. The logical and well-reasoned opinion of Chief Justice Marshall pointed out that in establishing a postal system there was the implied power to punish those who rob the mails, the power to contract for carriage of the mails, and so forth. Similarly, the grant and guarantee of freedom of worship, implies the power to adopt methods and means of assuring the exercise of that right. The validity, therefore, of legislation to that end, cannot be questioned.

It may be said that just as one may demand protection in the matter of freedom of religion, so may one expect protection with regard to freedom of speech, and that defamation and abuse can continue even though they incite hatred for that religion and lead to abuse of those who profess it. The answer to such an argument lies in the doctrine of balancing the interests of the freedoms. Since the need for tranquility within the community is paramount to the need for permitting freedom of speech inciting to genocide, the scale will dictate protection for the one who seeks it in the cause of harmony and peace.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- The Federalist* by Alexander Hamilton and others. Edited by Henry Cabot Lodge, Knickerbocker Press, 1892.
- Collected Legal Papers*, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Constable & Co., London, 1920.
- The English Philosophers from Bacon to Mill*. Edited by E. A. Burt, Modern Library, Random House, 1939.
- City Lawyer*, Arthur Garfield Hays, Simon & Schuster, New York, 1942.
- Our Civil Liberties*, Osmond K. Fraenkel, The Viking Press, 1944.
- Free Speech in the United States*, Zechariah Chafee, Jr., Harvard University Press, 1944.
- "Possible New Remedies for Errors in the Press," Zechariah Chafee, Jr., 60 Harv. Law Rev. 1, November, 1946.
- New Jersey Statutes Annotated, 2:157B, 1939.
- United States Supreme Court Reports.

Education in a Melting Pot

By MORRIS FREEDMAN

THE APARTMENT HOUSE in which we lived in the Bronx in the 1920's was—to use a term popular of that time—a “melting pot.” In our building, which overlooked the New York Central railroad tracks, there were Irish, Italian, and Jewish families and also several we referred to loosely as “American” because they fell into none of the other classifications. What we meant by “American” was probably “White Protestant.” The men were factory employees or small shop-keepers and, except for the “Americans,” they and their wives were immigrants of from 10 to 20 years standing.

On the surface, relations between the members of the several groups were friendly. Disputes arose from the usual frictions of apartment house life. A common cause for argument, for instance, was the practice of shaking out a mop into the yard where the wind carried the fuzzy dust into the rooms and onto the tables of households whose windows were open. The resulting arguments were heated and in the course of them the women shook their fists and threatened to have their husbands take up the matter with more effective weapons. (If, later, the two gentlemen accidentally met on the stairs, their faces went white, they nodded politely, and warily watched each other as they passed.) But the loudness of the discussion was no index of its seriousness. After several days the women forgot the argument—unless they had started a new one in the meanwhile—and the men could pass one another without fear of being tripped when not looking.

Never, as far as I can recall, were any references made in these brawls to the opponent's ancestry.

The antagonisms, however, came out in deeper, more sordid, and more lasting forms. I remember during one Passover when I was around seven my mother sent me up to the Italian family living above us with a plate of matzohs (unleavened bread) and a small decanter of wine. These are the main symbolic ingredients of the high Jewish holiday celebrating the liberation of the tribes of Israel from Egypt. To my mother, who is not orthodox, the offering was more than a gesture of holiday-spirit neighborliness. It represented a kind of defiant proof that we Jews were as much involved in religious ceremony as were the Catholics.

Tony, who was about my age, opened the door.

“I have matzohs and wine for everybody,” I said awkwardly. Our relation was usually not so formal.

He stood there uncertainly for a while, hand holding the knob of the door which was only partly open. “Hello, Morris,” he said. “I have to ask my mother.” He closed the door.

When he came back, there was fright on his face. “No, thanks,” he said. “No, we don't want any of it.” He closed the door again and left me standing there.

I felt relieved at not having to go through the embarrassment of entering a strange house, especially a Catholic one, about which I had heard strange things, and quickly forgot about the refusal. But a day later, when Tony and I were play-

ing in the backyard, he said to me, "You know why we didn't take the stuff? Because mama said you used Christian children's blood to make it." He stumbled over pronouncing "Christian."

I was more curious than shocked. I knew, and I think Tony did too, that this just wasn't true. When I asked my mother about it, she took the comment for granted. Her matter-of-fact tone implied that this atrocity was a natural part of a Christian's store of misinformation about Jews. "That's an old *bilbil* (cooked up story)," she said calmly, dismissing it.

My mother did not neglect to give me the counterpart of the training little Tony got. She told me not to get too close to any of the Italian children because they were all dirty. "You'll get lice and bugs from them," she said. She also told me unrepeatable vulgarities about the Catholic ritual. The Irish, she said, were all *shikurim* (drunkards), and the Americans all beat their wives and were lazy.

Once, one of the Irish youngsters in the house held a party for his classmates. I was invited but my mother didn't let me go. "They'll try to poison you. All Christians want to kill Jews," she explained.

More insidiously, she methodically instilled in me the idea that Jews were a superior people—more intelligent, more moral, more sober, harder-working, with a destiny to become leaders. She used to tell me that all *goyim* (gentiles) had *grubbeh kep* (thick heads) and that I should never let a *goy* get ahead of me. That was the greatest mark of disgrace. The smartest man in the world, she pointed out in support of her contention that the Jews were a chosen race, was Einstein, a Jew. Every success of a Jew mentioned in the *Jewish Daily Forward*, her everyday bible and library, from a Broadway racketeer to the latest boy genius (of whom there were always several in an issue—a curious super-abundance that struck my mother only as natural), was brought to my attention as additional proof. She watched with an

eagle eye my standing in school as compared to the gentle youngsters.

Going to school which was a block away, was mostly a social affair. We learned very little there. As I recall, we spent a few minutes each day on the multiplication table, spelling, and reading, and the rest of the time on discipline and punishments. We went in our best clothes, carefully washed and combed. (My mother kept one spotless handkerchief for me which she pinned to my shirt before sending me off to class on inspection days and removed when I came home.)

Before report cards were due at the end of each month, my mother gave me a present to deliver to my teacher. Once I was skipping to school with a box of candy when I tripped, fell, and spilled the candy out on the sidewalk. I carefully picked up all the pieces, whatever their condition, put them back in, closed the box, and continued skipping. My mother could not understand why my marks were lower that month than at any time before.

A major activity was courting little girls. I will never forget my affair with Renee, who was my first love.

The prejudices my mother was instilling in me, however seriously they might have been affecting me for later life, were for conscious purposes at that time no more than details of a kind of game. They were painless ammunition in the fights we used to have in the backyard. "You're a dirty wop. You're a stingy kike. You're a Christ-killer. Your father is a drunkard." These were expressions which we had been taught should hurt. Sometimes, we might be offended by a jeering tone, a nasty way of shouting these remarks, but the words alone were too removed from our immediate language needs to have any effect by themselves.

What happened with Renee made me realize how real and important these phrases were in the lives of our elders.

Renee's second name was White. She was an "American" and lived around the corner. We were in the same 3A class.

Her complexion was a healthy pink-white, she dressed prettily, and had a dainty set of manners.

Whenever we played "Farmer in the Dell" I tried to become the farmer so I could choose her for my wife. And I wasn't discouraged in my courtship when once, as the mouse, she repaid my devotion by selecting me as the cheese—who has to stand still like a moron after everyone has run away, while the circle of children laugh.

When class was over, I used to rush to the closet to get her little blue melton coat with the red beret sticking out of a pocket. Here, I first became aware of competition. Others, equally enamored of Renee, had noticed my attentiveness and how it pleased her. They used to race me to the wardrobe and grab for her coat. As many as four pair of hands at a time would be yanking at the sleeves and the bottom of the coat. But as in the game of trying to outstare someone, victory in this tug of love went to the one who held out longest, who was usually the one most foolhardy to dare the teacher's wrath. In my state of affection, the teacher was just another dragon to be braved.

After a while, the field narrowed to a boy named Arthur and myself; the others had either found other lady-loves who required less strenuous attention or had philosophically postponed the chase until later years. One day, as we were clutching the coat between us, Arthur kicked me in the stomach. That surprised me, but I knew a kick in the stomach was not nearly so painful as one in the shins. I kicked him twice, inspired by anger and love, below each knee. He screamed, relinquished the coat and yelled to the teacher that I had kicked him. She promptly sentenced me to stay after school. That mattered little. With a proud swagger, I delivered the coat to Renee.

After that, I had no rivals. Later that week, the seats of the class were changed around. I found myself next to Renee. I spent half of the first day, head resting

on my arms, dreamily gazing upon her. For a while, she did likewise, but soon got bored. When I got tired of this myself, I passed her a note with extreme care so as not to be caught by the teacher. "I'm glad to sit next to you," it said. "So am I," she wrote back. This went on, our successive epistles becoming more and more ardent.

Absorbed in our little world, we relaxed our precautions. The teacher noticed our mail service, came over, confiscated our messages, and derisively read them to the class. Because of her manner the other boys and girls guffawed, but I have an idea that if not influenced they would have taken our affair matter-of-factly. Such "arrangements" were common.

My mother was a great present giver in those days. Even if she didn't like a person, she would offer a present. Neighbors, teachers, friends, even the corner grocery man, were objects of her gift-bearing. Under my mother's inspiration, it occurred to me that I ought to do more for Renee than just moon at her, deliver her coat, and send occasional surreptitious notes. I would give her a present.

For three weeks, I saved up my candy money, and once added to my funds by claiming to need a new pencil. This was early in February and in some now-forgotten way I learned of St. Valentine's Day. I bought a giant Valentine for 15 cents, wrote "I love you" on it, and gave it to Renee one day when I handed over her coat. She was a little startled and wanted to give back the envelope that looked as large as a package. "No, it's for you," I said and pushed back her hand. "Take it home."

She did, and showed it to her mother. Several days later, Mrs. White met my mother. She had a big smile. "Hello, Mrs. Freedman," she said. "That was a lovely card you got for Morris to give to Renee, even if they are somewhat too young for each other."

That night my mother held court with

my father over me. "He writes he loves a *shikseh* (a gentile girl)," she said through her teeth to my father. "Already, he is going on the wrong path."

My parents bickered for a while as to whether it was the fault of my mother's conditioning and heredity or my father's heredity alone which caused me to become such a villain, but I knew that something drastic was going to take place quickly. Worked up by mother's gibes,

my father whipped me with his razor strap, muttering that I would realize in later years that this was for my own good. My mother stood by shouting I should never look on a *shikseh* again, or she'd herself finish the job my father had begun that night.

I don't think I ever did look at Renee again. It was many years before I was able to look at any gentile girl without a feeling of wrong-doing.

REFUGEE SHIP

By ELEANOR ALLETTA CHAFFEE

Here is the cargo no one claims. What currency
Is blood and tears and grief without a word?
Who deals in lots of human misery,
Or calculates wounds made without a sword?
This ship moves toward no harbor safe and sure:
Her chart is written in no map, no book.
Only the world's heart sickens with no cure
As from a printed page those lost eyes look
As Adam's must have, when behind him swung
The gates of Eden: and as all men's after
Who in despair have turned outcasts and flung
Reason from them, and courage, and all laughter.
This is the cargo labeled with a name
That all of us know, and know it to our shame.

The Jewish Writer and American Literature

By CHARLES I. GLICKSBERG

IF THE JEWISH WRITER stops to speculate on his anomalous position in American culture and American society, he is lost. His creative energy is inhibited at the source, doubt assails him. As soon as he begins to grapple with this complex problem, he becomes a divided being. He is a Jew, but what is a Jew and what is his peculiar function as an American writer? Whereas before he may have been writing in blissful unawareness that any complications existed, he now finds himself beset with a host of formidable difficulties. Some Jewish thinkers argue with passion that he must not forfeit his Jewishness; if he plays the game of "assimilation" he will become cheaply imitative and sterile and lose the distinctive genius that he might have contributed to the culture of his land. Others with prophetic earnestness adjure him to bear the cross of martyrdom, to become the apostle of righteousness and social justice. That is his peculiar mission on earth, that is the essence of Judaism, and he departs from it at his peril. The Zionists insist that the Jew will always remain an alien, no matter where he settles, until Palestine becomes the spiritual, cultural, and political homeland of Jewry. Finally, there are those who contend that the Jewish writer in this country is first and foremost an American and that his primary task and obligation is to make a worthy contribution to American literature. Where does the truth lie? What is the Jewish writer in America to do? How is he to choose amid all these bewildering and contradictory doctrines?

The Jewish people in America, unlike the European Jews, do not harbor har-

rowing recollections of the past; they are avid for life, eager to experience it in all its infinite variety; they have faith in the future. And this faith has a fructifying influence on Jewish writers in this land. Nevertheless, the phrase "Jewish writer" symbolizes the nature of their dilemma. They would prefer to work without any hampering adjectival qualifications, yet their racial past pursues them inexorably and will give their conscience no rest. Though desirous of gaining recognition as American authors, they are everywhere stigmatized as Jews.

In the light of these unhappy conditions, some feel that creative salvation for the Jewish writer is to be achieved by accentuating his Jewishness, by forging ties of solidarity with his blood, his kind. His salient mistake, according to this interpretation, is to write like an Englishman or American, not as a Jew. So remarkable are his powers of adaptation that, in spite of all handicaps, he succeeds in many forms of creative expression, but since his mind is completely divorced from the life of his people he suffers from a tormenting sense of guilt and unfulfilment.

This thesis, which has been developed with inspired eloquence by Ludwig Lewisohn, does not deny that the Jewish writer in America is productive and often highly successful; it declares that his very success is his undoing. The writer's voice is anxiously imitative, his vision uprooted and essentially alien. This is the Jewish writer's desperate and abortive means of compensating for the brand of the Ghetto: to deny his Jewishness. He achieves his ambition but at what a cost!

In spite of his desire to transform his

nature, there is an inner core of resistance, Lewisohn assures us, which he cannot overcome. He cannot sell his birthright; he is Jew more than in name and feature and heredity. Necessity may dictate expedient adaptations to his immediate environment; spiritually he cannot separate himself from his people, his past. Nor can he appease his conscience, which is the Torah of Israel. Whether or not he belongs to the God of Israel he belongs to Judaism. His unpardonable crime lies not so much in appropriating the cultural material of the West as in forsaking the wisdom and moral law of his people for those of the stranger in whose midst he dwells. The Jew, the indictment reads, has, by imposing an alien cultural and spiritual discipline on himself, warped his native faculties in the service of an ideal incompatible with his nature.

The argument is not that the Jew in the Diaspora must fail as a writer but that if he ceases to be a Jew such lacerating conflicts will be set up within him that he will ultimately fail. His mission, the undying mission of Israel, is to bring compassion and the light of wisdom and the law of righteousness into the world. Why should he pervert his inherited instincts, his rooted ancestral ideals? Why should he be ashamed of his racial past?

The dramatic story of Lewisohn's conversion to Judaism is too familiar to require repetition, but the psychological forces which motivated his conversion are of profound significance. In *Upstream* he has told how he prepared himself for the teaching of English in college and of the severe blow his pride received when he was rejected because of his Jewishness. Integrity, he concluded, was to be found in identifying himself with the Jewish community and in wholeheartedly embracing his Jewish heritage. The first fruit of his conviction that he must return to his own people was the book, *Israel*, written under an inner compulsion to function affirmatively as a Jew. Because he wanted his art to be vital and sound he felt the

necessity to be completely and authentically a Jew. In Palestine he recaptured the faith of his forbears, the inspiring perception that this was his land. Hence his impatience with those Jews who cast off their Jewishness and slavishly imitate the ways of the Gentile. "Only by being steadfastly themselves and Judaizing the civilization of their homeland in proportion to their numbers and ability will the Jews of the Diaspora be able to exchange cultural parasitism for cultural creativeness." The Jewish writer cannot creatively interpret Judaism if he does not live as a Jew. Only after a man has achieved inward unity as a Jew can he devote himself fruitfully to his calling as a writer.

It is evident, from the case of Ludwig Lewisohn, that not until the Jewish writer is discriminated against does the problem of his Jewishness arise. George Jean Nathan, Isaac Goldberg, Waldo Frank, Ben Hecht, Maxwell Bodenheim, Karl Shapiro, Isidor Schneider, Joseph Freeman, Matthew Josephson, Lewis Mumford, and Ludwig Lewisohn have won distinction as *American* writers. Why should their deserved fame be a cause for rejoicing among Jews? In what way do they function as Jews? Exactly how is their literary work differentiated from that of writers who are not Jewish? With the exception of Lewisohn's later books, no one reading their work would even suspect that a Jewish problem existed.

The impulse to label an American writer as Jewish, as if by virtue of his Jewishness his literary contribution is of a unique racial character, must be strongly resisted. There are many distinguished American Jewish writers who have written primarily as Americans and not as Jews; as men of talent and imagination and not as members of a racial or cultural minority group. Louis Untermeyer, brilliant anthologist, critic, and poet, helped, during the second decade of this century, to launch the poetic renaissance in the United States. James Oppen-

heim, the impassioned mystic and one of the editors of *The Seven Arts*, wrote with a brooding compassion for all life, his lyrics instinct with an idealism and universality that had nothing characteristically Jewish about them. Albert Halper wrote "proletarian" fiction that was concerned rather than with Jewish Welt-schmerz with the effects of economic misery on the lives of people. Ira Wolfert's powerful first novel, *Tucker's People*, dealt with the numbers racket and proved a searing indictment of capitalist morality. The few Jewish characters in the novel are the only indication that the author was Jewish by birth and upbringing. Lionel Trilling, an influential American critic, has published studies of Matthew Arnold and E. M. Forster. How much Judaism is there in the published writings of Sidney Hook or Morris R. Cohen?

The facts speak for themselves and reduce to nonsense the special pleading of those who have the Jewish writer in America express the Jewish consciousness, the Jewish tradition, the mythical Jewish essence. Of all the Jewish writers in the twentieth century who have made some significant contribution to American letters, how many have concerned themselves predominantly with Jewish life and Jewish themes? How many of their books betray characteristically Jewish attitudes, feelings, and sensibility? Those who look for these things, and therefore presumably believe in them, are unconsciously or consciously trying to "racialize" literature, to raise the walls of a psychological Ghetto in the heart of America.

It is absurd to expect a young Jewish writer, educated in American public schools, speaking the language that Shakespeare and Milton and Emerson spoke, reared in the political democratic tradition of Jefferson and Jackson and Lincoln and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, inspired by the work of Shelley and Whitman, Hawthorne and Melville, Norris and Dreiser and Dos Passos, to concern him-

self exclusively or even chiefly with Jewish subjects—as if the life of the imagination, the creative life, can be thus circumscribed. There is, of course, nothing to stop him from using Jewish themes if he finds them fruitful and can bring them vividly to life. That is the fascination of the creative life: the writer has the whole universe of perception, memory, feeling, and experience to choose from. There are no interdictions, no taboos. But to exploit such themes as a matter of conscience or duty is to sin against the Holy Ghost, to violate the integrity of the creative soul. There are incalculable riches in the Talmud and Torah, in the history, traditions, and legends of the Jews, in the glory that was once Jerusalem, in the heroic travail of the Jewish people, their odyssey of suffering and persecution, in the faith that burned steadily in them during the darkest period of exile. All this, however, is of the past and holds as little appeal for the Jewish writer who is plunged up to his neck in the crucial issues of his own day as Africa has for the Negro writer in the United States. He has the freedom to choose, but since he belongs to America he will partake of its destiny and contribute in whatever way he can to enrich its cultural storehouse.

Consider, however, the curious spiritual pilgrimage of Ben Hecht, successful novelist, scenario writer, and producer of movies. For many years, Hollywood was more prominent in his mind than Jerusalem or the plight of the Jews. What had he to do with Judaism or Zionism? And yet he underwent a radical change of heart. In 1944 appeared *A Guide for the Bedevilled*. The date is important. The war was still going on. Three million Jews in Germany, Poland, Rumania, Hungary, and conquered parts of Russia had been exterminated. Before Germany was finally brought to its knees, another million had been killed off. When he contemplated these appalling figures—the statistics are flesh and blood, Jewish men and women and children—he was forced to take stock

of himself and decide on what action to pursue. Now that he has thought the problem through he has no use for those who insist on obfuscating the issue behind a thick cloud of words. The issue is clear-cut and incontrovertible. Bitterly he chastizes those Jews who outdo themselves in the effort to appear un-Jewish.

And yet, for many years Ben Hecht, preoccupied with his career as a writer, had never bothered about the Jewish problem, regarding himself proudly as an American. Now he concludes that those who try to conceal their Jewishness are living in a psychological Ghetto. Now he is fired with a mission: he must have his say about the Jews, he must identify himself with the cause of his persecuted people. It is necessary for the Jews to speak up—as Jews. No one will come to their rescue if they fail to do so. There is the community of fate from which they cannot escape. With equal bluntness Hecht assails those Jews who take refuge from the Jewish problem by embracing Communism. As Communists they have no need to worry about the tragedy of the Jews trapped in Europe. By espousing Communism and placing their faith in Soviet Russia, they cease to be Jews.

Highly significant of another group of intellectuals is the career of Waldo Frank. After expounding a mystical metaphysic that stressed individual wholeness out of which collective wholeness would spring, he became a disciple of Spinoza. When this position proved untenable in an age of technological unemployment and mass misery he set out on a new quest to establish social justice by seeking to reconcile Spinoza with Marx. Yet his field of vision, his emphasis, was unmistakably American. This was his land. Had he not published *The New America* in 1922? Had he not served as the cultural interpreter of the United States to Hispanic America? Not until the thirties did he venture to take his stand on the Jewish question.

Waldo Frank has made the astounding

discovery that Jews are different, but not for the reasons usually assigned. They are different because they stem from a religious-prophetic cultural tradition which makes them the apostles of justice and brotherhood, the consecrated conscience of mankind, no matter in what land they happen to settle. Donning the mantle of Isaiah, Waldo Frank calls down anathema on those Jews who fail to live up to his exalted conception of Judaism. Their "difference" consists in remaining unalterably true to their vision of God, in pursuing righteousness and justice regardless of the sacrifice this involves, in heroically striving to establish the brotherhood of man on earth. That is the Great Conspiracy, declares Frank, of which the Jews of the world are guilty. If the anti-Semites seize on this as a pretext for intensified persecution, then so be it. The Jews will have fulfilled their destiny, which is nothing less than to be the messiahs and martyrs of global democracy.

In *The Jew in Our Day*, Waldo Frank refuses to believe that there is no Jewish race. The Jew exemplifies a spiritual idea and what caused the race to survive in the face of bloody oppression is that they conscientiously strove to work out this idea in their way of life. He has nothing but contempt for the Jew who is a Jew because he was born a Jew. Such creatures have nothing to sustain them but a common heritage of persecution, and that is essentially a negative attitude. No, Waldo Frank wants the Jews to bear their burden proudly; they must organize a spiritual community which will dedicate itself to the task of implementing the Jewish ideal. They must become creative. Not that Jewish art must confine itself to Jewish subjects. That is a provincial conception. The creative spirit, declares Frank, remains essentially Jewish by incarnating the vision of the eternal, the truth of the ideal.

Unfortunately this stirring plea is vitiated by one flaw: Waldo Frank is calling upon the Jews to dedicate themselves to

the task of destroying industrial capitalism. In 1933, during the height of the depression, Waldo Frank asserted that "every man who wants to *enact* social justice in the modern world must be a Marxist in spirit although he may reject certain Marxist dogmas. The modern Jew, if he is to exist, must interpret Marx as a prophet as surely as his forbears interpreted Moses and Isaiah." This is a euphemistic way of saying that Jews must become Communists, and active Communists at that, if they wish to fulfil their prophetic mission, even if they reject certain Marxist dogmas. And he makes this extraordinary recommendation though knowing full well that it will not be acceptable to the great mass of Jews. His program that the Jews should ally themselves with the proletariat, whose historic function (it is alleged) is to end economic exploitation and remove all class distinctions, is nothing less than fantastic, pure theory-mongering. To the objection that such commitments would intensify the persecution of the Jews, Waldo Frank replies that their lot is growing steadily worse. Since the Jews are going to suffer in any event, let them give the anti-Semites good reasons for persecuting them.

Frank realizes that it is unmitigated folly to expect all Jews to bear the cross of martyrdom; they must live. Yet he insists that they should give whatever aid they can to the forces of progress and revolution so that true democracy may prevail. Though he does not oppose Zionism, he maintains that it fails to solve any problem for those Jews who have no desire to settle in Palestine. Besides, he decries the narrow conception of nationalism. The mission of Israel is universal not parochial, spiritual not territorial.

Despite the moral exhortation of a Ludwig Lewisohn, the messianic Marxist zealotry of a Waldo Frank, and the flaming militancy of a Ben Hecht, the Jewish problem still remains bafflingly complex. For there is no such thing as a specifically

Jewish consciousness. As we have pointed out, the Jewish writer in America is first and foremost an American and only secondarily a Jew. He addresses his work to all America, not to an insulated, racially "different" Jewish community. His contribution belongs to American, not to Jewish, literature. At heart the Jew desires nothing more than to identify himself with the people, the culture, the traditions of this land. The tragedy of alienation arises when democracy fails of its promise and anti-Semitism forces upon him the role of a pariah. Only when he is denied his rights as a man, as an American, does he write with accusing bitterness and flaunt his Jewishness with defiance. It would be an ironic miscarriage of justice and a perversion of the democratic ideal if the American Jews by their own efforts succeeded in confining their literature within a cultural Ghetto.

Each Jew has his cultural roots, his memories, his aspirations and loyalties and ideals, his personal identity. There are, in the United States, Jews of all kinds. Why, in God's name, should the Jewish writer not be free to write about whatever he pleases, so long as he can make a genuinely original contribution to literature? There must be no sacred covenants, no racial or religious commitments, no tribal imperatives. If he wishes to deal with the Jewish problem, the fate of the Jew in a hostile, anti-Semitic environment, that is his privilege. If he desires to write about matters that are unrelated to his Jewishness, that, too, is his privilege. Is Edna Ferber to be condemned as a novelist because she is interested in portraying the American scene? The world of art is neither religious nor anti-religious nor racial. Where shall the Jewish writer draw the line? In what role does he best serve mankind, as a creative spirit or as a creative Jew? Was George Brandes any the less a Jew because he took world literature as his province? There can be no question of "assimilation." The Jew who

writes in the language that Shakespeare and Milton and Emerson and Whitman used, has already been assimilated. Was Lewisohn less a Jew when he composed *Expression in America* than when he penned *Israel*?

There can be no arbitrary solution of this vexed problem. What is profoundly true for a Ludwig Lewisohn does not apply to an impressionist free lance dramatic critic like George Jean Nathan. What a fervent Zionist preaches is damnable doctrine to a Socialist like Isaac Goldberg or a Communist like Isidor Schneider. There are all kinds of writers and all sorts of Jews and no formula can be devised to apply to them all. As a member of a professional group, the writer is burdened with a responsibility that reaches beyond categories of class, religion, or race. His creative task is fundamentally to report life in all its truthfulness and totality, uncensored and undistorted. If he is a Jew, he is not limited to Jews and Jewish problems, if these are not of vital import to him. He can write about all the subjects which engross the attention of the writer without being under an ethical compulsion to force his genius. Whether Jew or Gentile, the writer must have roots, and the roots of the Jewish writer in the United States are fixed deep in American soil.

He certainly does not want to be shut up in a cultural Ghetto and have his writings branded in advance as invidiously and recognizably Jewish. We are thus inevitably led to the conclusion that there is no Jewish essence, no specific Jewish soul. Those who argue in this fashion are simply deluding themselves. True, Jews are different, but in what does the "difference" consist? In differences forced upon the Jew because he is a member of

a proscribed, persecuted minority. That is all there is to it, if we accept the environmentalist interpretation of human nature.

The future of the Jewish writer in America, then, depends on the future of anti-Semitism. Ernest Boyd is right in his retort to Lewisohn: If Jews set themselves up as a unique and unassimilable people, they will be treated as such and it will serve them right. They will be adding dangerous ammunition to the arsenal of the anti-Semites. The Jewish writer functions as an American who happens to be Jewish just as Whitman wrote as an American who happened to be born a Quaker. Moreover, is it wise for Jews to espouse only Jewish causes, to stress, fanatically and with anguish, the suffering of their own people? The desperate situation of the Jews in Europe calls for emergency measures; help is urgently needed and must be rendered; but this incessant harping on Jewish misery is a species of monomania. Injustice is indivisible and must be attacked resolutely wherever it appears. The violation of democracy in any part of the world directly or indirectly affects the condition of the Jews, even if it is not immediately related to their problem. If the Jew is a figure of righteousness, a believer in democracy, then he must work with equal zeal for all mankind as well as his own kindred. There is nothing incompatible or quixotic in supporting such an ideal. He is not dissipating his forces or compromising his aim. On the contrary, he gains enormously in strength and numbers by thus universalizing his mission on earth. There will be no peace for Jew or Gentile on this hate-convulsed earth, now menaced by the Armageddon of atomic warfare, until the spirit and substance of democracy is achieved for all.

Catholicism in American Life

By HEINZ EULAU

WHEN IT COMES to evaluate the role played by Catholicism in American life, even angels tread with caution. Ignorance, misinformation, falsification, and misinterpretation make a sober appraisal both difficult and dangerous. Opponents of Catholic religious doctrine often cannot see anything but evil in all Catholic activities. Catholics, always somewhat hypersensitive on the subject of their religion, as often confuse criticism of the Church's secular activities with anti-Catholic bigotry.

Nobody can quarrel with the *National Catholic Almanac's* statement that the Church "is now recognized as an integral part of the life of the nation. While her opinion is not always a decisive or even a leading factor in the solution of social questions, her attitude is not denied consideration." But it follows that Catholic activities in non-religious fields must be subject to the same kind of judgment as those of political parties, trade unions, and other pressure groups.

It is, of course, not always easy to keep religion and politics apart. If non-Catholics are reluctant to support Catholic candidates for public office, it may be that they vaguely or consciously suspect Catholicism's grim opposition to the democratic secular state, founded on the separation of church and government, and guarantor of religious liberty. Only last year, for instance, the Jesuit weekly *America* attacked the "false concept of state secularism, based on a materialist and atheist philosophy of human life and society," for the secular state "is simply a political system devised as an instrument for imposing this philosophy on public life and legislation, on the school

system and on all manner of social institutions."

Catholic doctrine itself distinguishes between matters of faith and morals, on the one hand, and matters of politics, on the other. But it is a distinction which even liberal Catholics find difficult to maintain. Americans, wrote Father George Higgins in 1944 in *Catholic Action*, the official organ of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, "would be foolish indeed, however, to think that this nation, or any other nation, can continue to escape the horrors of internal class warfare unless the full body of Catholic social teaching is given practical, concrete application as quickly as possible." Spreading the Catholic faith is not only a religious, but a patriotic duty as well. From this patriotic duty, Father Higgins continued, springs the obligation "to Catholicise the fatherland . . . True social progress, including material and cultural progress, can only be achieved when the moral values taught by Catholicism gain general acceptance among the masses of men."

This sort of attitude explains to a large extent the social and psychological tension which has been growing between Catholics and Protestants since the end of the war. Genuine inter-faith cooperation, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, President of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, charged on Reformation Day, 1945, is endangered by what Protestants "believe to be an attempt upon the part of the Roman Catholic Church to exercise political domination here, similar to the control exercised in many nations."

Bishop Oxnam's apprehensions are

symptomatic of the opposition to Catholicism. There is a deep-seated wide-spread anti-Catholic prejudice among large sectors of the American people. Anti-Catholicism has deep roots in American history. There were the anti-Catholic American Native Party of the 1830's, the Know Nothing Party in the middle of the last century, the American Protective Association of the 1890's, and the night-riding, cross-burning Ku Klux Klan of recent memory. Millions of Protestant churchgoers are exposed today to vile anti-Catholic tirades of fundamentalist preachers and publications.

Their long history of persecution and minority status in America may still cause Catholics to compensate for an apparent inferiority complex by an over-aggressive attitude. But, prior to World War I, the Catholic Church, torn by conflict due to the heterogeneous origin of the Catholic clergy and laity, was a force making for religious tolerance and democracy. Only the gradual Americanization of the Catholic immigrant population created greater unity among the faithful. During the twenties, however, Catholicism still moved with great caution. But the anti-Catholicism that flared up in the course of Al Smith's presidential campaign left the Church embittered, and greatly disillusioned with the American secular state. She began to attack the secular state, but with secular means and on secular grounds. This development explains, in part at least, Catholic activities in many areas of America's social and cultural life. There is today hardly a field of social or cultural endeavor in which Catholic interest groups are not applying some political pressure.

Most of the Church's secular activities are directed by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, which represents the united action of the nation's 22 Archbishops and 134 Bishops in national, social, and civic policies. Its program and recommendations touch 23 million American Catholics who form one-sixth of the

country's population and make the Catholic Church the largest single religious body in the United States. The NCWC, the Catholic historian Theodore Maynard has said, "has become the central coordinating agency of all the Church's official activities and, as such, has enormous historical importance, especially as its possibilities are almost boundless."

The boundlessness of the NCWC's possibilities was pointed out on the eve of Catholic "press month," February, 1946, by Archbishop John Gregory Murray, chairman of the NCWC Press Department. "The entire Catholic population of the country," he said, "should accept the responsibility of a crusade that would not only put a Catholic paper in the home of every Catholic in the United States, but in the home of every non-Catholic in the country, through a bona fide, fully-paid subscription to the Catholic paper being published in the territory nearest to the recipient of the donated paper. This would mean a total circulation of 100 million Catholic papers every week."

The Archbishop's words may be more flamboyant than realistic, but they indicate the importance attributed by the Church to the power of the press. Catholic press circulation has steadily grown in recent years. The number of Catholic publications rose from 264 in 1925 to 367 in 1945. Among these publications are four dailies, 122 weeklies, 132 monthlies, and 52 quarterlies, published in English as well as eleven foreign languages. Their circulation varies widely. The weekly *Our Sunday Visitor*, Hearstian in its screaming make-up and hysterical approach, has a circulation of almost 600,000. *Extension*, a "popular" cousin of the *Saturday Evening Post*, has a circulation of over 300,000. The monthly *Catholic Digest*, an imitation of the *Reader's Digest*, has a circulation of 170,000.

Mainstay of the Catholic press are the diocesan papers. It may be, as the liberal Catholic Ruth O'Keefe once said, that in spite of their large circulation they "make

almost no impression on Catholics because so few read them." But the Catholic hierarchy seems to think otherwise. It maintains the NCWC Press Department, the largest special-interest news service of its kind in the country, on which for financial reasons most Catholic papers almost exclusively have to rely. It assures the Church an unequalled opportunity to influence the political convictions of the faithful. The Press Department offers its subscribers a weekly news service of about 50,000 words, a feature service, a news picture service, an editorial information service, syndicated columns, and so on.

A powerful Catholic press is, of course, only one weapon in the Church's propaganda armory. The other is pressure on secular newspapers, first through direct intervention, and, if that does not work, through economic boycott. Most newspapers do not care to get into difficulties with the Church, whose power they may have felt, and discreet silence is for them often the lesser of two evils.

Economic boycott has long proved to be an efficient instrument of political action in one of the Church's most criticized cultural activities—movie censorship. Of over 100 million annual theatergoers, a large percentage are Catholics. They make up a body of patrons whose moral conceptions and political predilections can easily determine the financial success or failure of a motion picture. When the Catholic hierarchy, through the Catholic Legion of Decency, in 1934, undertook its first big drive against what it considered salacious films, box office receipts suddenly fell off in many cities as a result of a boycott.

Catholicism is not solely responsible for the tortuous growth of film censorship in America—linked with the name of the Hays Office and the Production Code of 1930. Bigotry knows no religious barriers. But the Catholic Legion of Decency's preponderant influence on movie censorship—a story many times told in the past

—is beyond question. It was Catholic activity which revived the dormant Code in 1934, and Catholic pressure sees to its vigorous enforcement. Every feature-length film released in the United States is reviewed by the Legion, and every week its accumulative list of ratings goes out to the Catholic press, churches, schools, and organizations.

The movie industry's Production Code itself betrays its Catholic inspiration by the glib finality with which it refers to "wrongdoing, evil or sin," to "law, natural and human," and by the arbitrary exclusion of sex hygiene, venereal disease, and child birth as proper film subjects. It can be conceded that in the great majority of the over 5,000 pictures reviewed between 1936 and 1945 the Legion did not go beyond its self-imposed standards of censorship—"that motion pictures conform to the accepted and traditional morality upon which the home and civilization are founded." But in a number of cases, the Legion's ratings were influenced by considerations not publicly admitted. Spain, the Soviet Union, and Mexico are subjects displeasing to the Church in one way or another, and the Legion has undoubtedly been guided by political preferences in rating such films as "For Whom the Bell Tolls," "Blockade," or "Mission to Moscow." In the case of the first it based its objection on the famous sleeping-bag scene, though it was presented harmlessly enough. In the case of the third, classified as "unobjectionable for adults," the Legion advised that "the film in its sympathetic portrayal of the governing regime in Russia makes no reference to the anti-religious philosophy and policy of said regime."

The real question, however, is not how far the Legion goes in its censorship activities, but whether in a democratic society a sectarian organization should as a matter of principle wield such powerful influence for censorship as to affect the entire community. The fight over the picture "Birth of a Baby" exemplifies the socially

harmful policy of the Legion and its efforts to impose Catholic precepts on the American people as a whole. Definitely harmful was the withdrawal from national distribution of an educational film on venereal disease, "To the People of the United States," produced by Walter Wanger in 1944 with public funds and approved, prior to the Legion's intervention, by the U.S. Public Health Service, the Army, and the Office of War Information. The American people were deprived of seeing one of the best and most important films in years as a result of Catholic censorship.

The Legion has, of course, the right to judge pictures, make its ratings known and influence people not to attend theaters. But the effect of its influence is far greater because of the disciplined response it can elicit from a strong minority, with an immediate bearing on box office receipts. The objectionable aspect of its right to do so is that it need not bother with legal tests of immorality, and that it puts in motion its own machinery of sanctions. Knowledge of forthcoming pressure from Catholic sources influences a producer's decision whether to shoot a picture at all and how to shoot it. The fact that major producers do not defy the Legion's standards bears this conclusion out. Many Hollywood studios have Catholic program directors. Catholic censorship of the movies is complete.

If courts of law have not become battle grounds of Catholic efforts in the field of culture, they have in the field of education. The separation of state and church had led, in the second quarter of the last century, to the founding of parochial schools where Catholic children could receive religious education. Subsequently, what had been a necessity became a virtue. Today, a network of some 10,000 parochial or private elementary and high schools places millions of American youth under exclusive Catholic instruction.

Maintenance of this extensive school system has become an increasingly heavy

burden to the Catholic Church. Most state constitutions prohibit the use of public funds, raised by taxes, for private schools. Catholic spokesmen argue, therefore, that as Catholics pay public-school taxes in addition to church fees, Catholic schools should at least receive some public aid. Their efforts have not been in vain. Free school transportation has been provided to Catholic school students in a number of states. Similarly, free textbooks are now supplied through public aid to parochial students in at least half a dozen states.

In Washington, the NCWC lobbies in favor of making federal aid available to religious schools in the federal-aid-to-education programs before Congress. The NCWC Education Department opposed the Thomas-Hill bill, sponsored by the National Education Association, which "would grant aid only to public elementary and second schools," and it lobbied in behalf of the Mead-Aiken bill which "would include aid in its provisions to the children of all schools, public and non-public."

The Catholic Church is not alone interested in breaking down the separation of state and church in education, though it is the most persistent pressure group. The well-organized campaign to introduce all kinds of religious instruction into public schools—bible reading, release time and religious instruction during school hours—is supported by the Protestant and Jewish denominations as well.

From cradle to grave, and even before conjugal conception, the Catholic Church lays claim to the body and soul of those born into her fold. For this reason she opposes "mixed marriages," unless they are consummated on Catholic terms; also divorce, sterilization, and birth control. For the same reason she insists on a pre-eminent position in education and mobilizes Catholic youth into organizations which operate "under the vigilant eyes and immediate control of the Bishop." Each one of these efforts is an explosive

issue. Each must put the Church into conflict with American democracy.

In the matter of birth control, particularly, Catholicism seeks to impose its views on the rest of society and make Catholic policy public policy. Of course, the Church is entitled to its views and may influence the faithful. But throughout the United States, the Church is constantly seeking to prevent public health services from giving advice on birth control. From the very inception of the planned parenthood movement it has attempted, often with success, to interfere with sound medical practices. Violence, intimidation, and economic boycott have been variously employed. In Connecticut and Massachusetts Catholic pressure resulted in the closing down of birth control clinics, and physicians may not prescribe birth control even if a patient's health and life are endangered. In these states Catholic victory on the issue of birth control has clearly violated the liberal and democratic doctrine of separation of state and church.¹

Apart from genuinely moral considerations, one reason, perhaps, for Catholicism's violent opposition to birth control may be the fear of losing numerical ground as the country's birth rate goes down. The Church, according to the *Catholic Almanac*, is not making "satisfactory progress in winning non-members to the true faith. Though in the year 1944 almost 85,000 converts were recorded, this number is an insignificant proportion of the 110 million outside the fold." There is good reason to believe, moreover, that birth control, inter-marriage, the disintegrating effects of urban life on the family, and secular education have been important factors in desertions from the Catholic Church. There are no reliable figures of desertions. But Catholic "leakage" is mainly the reason why the Church is mobilizing for political and social action

rather than relying on old-fashioned, strictly religious proselytism.

Efforts are under way to intensify Catholic missionary work among American Negroes. As over seven million Negroes, out of a total of thirteen million, do not belong to any religious denomination, they offer a fertile soil for conversion. However, the average annual number of Negro converts has only been about 5,000. One reason for this past lack of success has been racial prejudice on the part of white Catholics. "All the organized agencies of the Catholic Church in the U.S. do not succeed in contributing more than \$300,000 per annum to the work of bringing the Catholic Church to the 13 million Negroes of the country," *America* complained some years ago. In Negro minds, consequently, the Reverend J. B. Tennyly has pointed out, the Catholic Church "is regarded as only another unfriendly white institution."

The need for breaking down the racial barrier has therefore been recognized as the only realistic approach to missionary work among Negroes. It cooperates with the Clergy Conference on Negro Welfare and similar councils in other cities. Although the American hierarchy has not issued any official statement in favor of a federal, permanent Fair Employment Practices Committee, a few Bishops are fighting for it. Bishop Francis J. Haas has served as chairman of the temporary FEPC in 1943. Bishop Robert E. Lucey of San Antonio and Bernard J. Sheil of Chicago are outstanding anti-discriminationists. In New York, Michigan, and Ohio the local Bishops endorsed state anti-discrimination laws. Whatever their ultimate purpose from the Catholic point of view, these efforts are socially constructive and progressive. Visible results of increasingly friendly relations between Negroes and the Church are the less hostile attitude of the secular Negro press toward Catholicism, and the growing amount of space given to the Negro question in Catholic papers. On the occasion

¹ See Cornelius P. Trowbridge, "Catholicism Fights Birth Control," *New Republic*, January 22, 1945.

of the Interracial Council's tenth anniversary, the Reverend Higgins of the NCWC's Social Action Department called upon Catholic groups to take "the initiative in a dignified but aggressive way in asking their Senators and Representatives to do their part in seeing that this bill (FEPC) is enacted."

The Church is also making great efforts to win a place for herself among the white rural population of the nation. As about eighty percent of America's Catholics live in cities, the Church sees in the decreasing urban birth rate a great threat to her influence. The unbalanced concentration of Catholics in big cities, *Land and Home*, the organ of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, editorialized in June, 1945, "is dangerous. It's a Frankenstein for the Catholic Church. It's a graveyard for some of the finest Catholic blood in America." The Catholic Rural Life Conference was founded, therefore, "to strengthen the Church in the rural sections of the United States," and with the aim of "caring for the spiritually underprivileged of rural America."

But in addition to promoting religious instruction and services in rural areas, the Conference also fosters church-related credit unions and cooperatives. To check large-scale corporation farming, it advocates "legislation which will offer special financial inducements to owner-operators of family type farms." For workers on the big industrialized farms the Conference demands "a living wage, decent housing conditions and collective bargaining."

Catholicism is by no means the ideological and organizational monolith in the political order that bigoted anti-Catholics make it out to be. Good evidence for this is the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists which operates within both the AFL and CIO. Its task is not to fence off the Catholic rank and file from existing unions, but rather to bring unions under Catholic leadership; to imbue Catholic workers with union consciousness and simultaneously keep them within the

bosom of the Church. It is not surprising, therefore, that the ACTU spearheads the drive against Communist leadership in many local unions. However, it is also very active in supporting progressive labor legislation.

The ACTU program is based, of course, on the Papal Encyclicals which express the social teachings of the Church. It is, as John C. Cort, a Catholic labor expert, has said, "probably the most extraordinary combination of radicalism, conservatism and plain common sense ever seen in the American labor movement." Though opposed to the Communists, the ACTU supported the CIO's Political Action Committee during the last presidential campaign. Through a well-edited, progressive labor press and labor education schools the ACTU is becoming increasingly influential in industrial centers with a large Catholic population. But labor leaders do not look upon Catholic or any other religious penetration of their unions as an unmixed blessing. As Daniel Tobin, the Teamsters' leader, said some time ago, religious groups in unions create "dissension, prejudice, religious hatred . . . Now when labor is in the ascendancy and of some importance in the nation, we have different branches of the church endeavouring to creep in, and eventually they will look for a dominating influence within unions through the back door."

It was certainly not accidental that the ACTU's founding coincided with the great CIO organized drive in 1937. The membership of the American Church comes predominantly from the ranks of the working class, especially immigrants and their sons of Irish, Italian, and Polish descent, many of them unskilled laborers. The unionization of these unskilled masses by the CIO gave Catholic trade unionism its initial impetus.

There was another, if less direct, reason for the emergence of Catholic trade unionism in 1937. By that time the Catholic hierarchy had succeeded in decisively influencing American foreign policy in favor

of the fascist side in the Spanish Civil War, largely through stifling courageous exposure and honest discussion in the American press.

However, the Spanish Civil War was also a turning-point in American Catholicism. For it crystallized the issues which during the next decade were to divide mankind. Political factions, liberal and fascist, developed within the Catholic fold. The disastrous pro-Franco policy of the great majority of the hierarchy was resisted by a small though influential group of Catholic laymen and clergymen around the liberal weekly *Commonweal*. The organization of the ACTU was another manifestation of Catholic liberalism. It would be unjust to discuss American Catholicism without giving proper weight to these revolts against official Catholic policy which were bound to appear in American democratic environment.

On the other hand, Catholicism's own lunatic fringe—the Coughlins, Currans, and the Christian Front—took the natural and inevitable step of favoring and supporting the Axis cause. Race hatred and violence became their tools of politics. While it would be unfair to blame the whole Church for the words and actions of this group, it is true, of course, that Father Coughlin and his ilk could have been silenced if the American hierarchy or the Vatican had chosen to do so. Since the war Coughlinism has gone underground. Whether and when it will reappear would seem to depend on the future of American politics generally. It was as much the by-product of the pro-fascist isolationist current in pre-war America as, if we accept anti-Catholic opinion, the result of Catholic inclination toward authoritarianism. As H. T. Maguire stated in a courageous communication to the *Commonweal* of June 1, 1945:

During the two decades that witnessed the rise and crystallization of fascism and communism, Catholic intellectual leadership in America directed its most severe, unequivocal and persistent condemnation against communism and soft-pedaled the fight against fascism. The hys-

terical anti-communism in Catholic colleges and the Catholic press was almost an obsession; anti-fascism was hardly heard above a whisper in most Catholic circles.

It seems that the Church has learned very little from this experience. The anti-Communist and anti-Soviet campaign now waged in the American press and in the halls of Congress was anticipated by the hierarchy immediately after the end of the war in 1945. It is, of course, rooted in Catholic religious opposition to "atheistic communism." But the border-line between anti-communism *per se* and red-baiting of liberals is hazardous, especially for Catholics. "The persecution of a God-hating regime of Bolsheviks is more direct and brutal but ultimately not more disastrous than the studied, systematic attacks against religion by our so-called intellectuals," Monsignor Michael J. Ready said some years ago. And today anti-communism permeates most Catholic secular activities. Catholicism's anti-Communist crusade may well become a preoccupation. It is a dangerous trend. However justified genuine opposition to Communism may be, if it disregards civil liberties, it will have disastrous consequences. For fascism is the inevitable by-product of political hysteria.



A Young Girl

BEREL SATT

Yivo—A Cultural Force

By MARSHALL SKLARE

THE RECENT VOLUME published by the Yiddish Scientific Institute is a dynamic collection of academic Jewish thought.¹ It demands a great deal more than the traditional brief summary and criticism. For the reader to understand what is involved in the publication of such a book, he must have a keen insight into the vast movements which constitute the record of modern Jewish history. More particularly, he must possess a feeling for the tragic, for that mood of frustration yet of spiritual exaltation which pervades it. He must understand "dos folk Yisroel" as the men who are with the Yiddish Scientific Institute or who are on the staffs of other institutions know and understand. The publications of the Yivo have featured not only their own men but those individuals from other groups together with native born individuals who demonstrate knowledge and creativity in things Jewish.

The Institute, founded in Vilna in 1925, came to New York City at the outbreak of the war and now occupies what was once the headquarters of the Jewish Theological Seminary. In contradistinction to the majority of our institutions of higher learning, it trains no rabbis or social workers in the conventional sense.² Its director is a scientist and not an academic politician like some of his col-

leagues. Staff members neither retreat into the comforting intricacies of their own specialties nor advance boldly into the fields of public relations and personal publicity. In a word, Yivo is anti-obscurantist, it is an island of free intelligence in a sectarian Jewish community. It is modern—a dangerous quality in a community whose social studies are generally nineteenth century though some of its more aggressive teachers adopt the parlance of modern social science.

All this is not to imply that the Yivo is a model institution. It has its all too human limitations. One need only browse through this "Annual of Jewish Social Science" to see prejudice and sectarianism. The first is the tie of Yivo to the Yiddish language. To understand the affinity of the leaders of the institution to the Yiddish tongue would require a thorough analysis stressing the reaction of European Jewish intellectuals to the extremes of the Haskalah. Suffice it to say that a group of these thinkers were interested in elevating the "Jargon" to the status of a truly modern tongue, and therefore added to the traditional fields of social studies such things as linguistics, literature, and folklore. This group was well on the road to the accomplishment of its objective when it was overwhelmed by the Nazi invader, its native city sacked, and the Jewish masses who were its consuming interest destroyed in the gas chambers. Only the haven of New York remained: a home that offered security but a Jewish community in which Yiddish and Yiddishism was only one color in the spectrum. The Yivo was therefore

¹ *Yivo Annual of Jewish Social Science*, Vol. I, Yiddish Scientific Institute—Yivo, New York, 1946, 319 pp.

² We exclude the schools in Palestine as well as other institutions such as the Jewish Teachers Seminary and Peoples University, and the new school for Jewish communal workers both located in New York City.

under the necessity of effecting a compromise with the dominant language, and of late it has been translating and publishing in English. Not only this, but Yivo has left the confines of the spiritual Ghetto and made contact with American professors and intellectuals. It is interesting to note that in these circles its publications (the present one is no exception) are sometimes more highly esteemed than in the Jewish *Klaus*.

Though there has been reconciliation, we can see how the Yivo has not abandoned its faith in the language and culture of its choice. Truly the transition which the institution has made is a difficult one, and though many would point out the existence of a lag between present day needs and Yivo *Weltanschauung*, we will pursue a tentative neutrality. Their classic point of view is illustrated in a number of articles, as for example, that of Samuel Niger-Charney who writes on "Simon Dubnow as a Literary Critic." Here he demonstrates Dubnow's struggle to accept Yiddish, for the great historian was at first skeptical of the possibility of creative Jewish expression in "Jargon." Israel Zinberg, of blessed memory, in "A Defense of Yiddish" details the struggle of the vernacular with Hebrew and goes back to the conflict between Hebrew and Aramaic to show the beginnings of the controversy. Judah A. Joffe and Leo Spitzer engage in heated discussion ("The Origin of the Word *Ghetto*"), since the former claims a Yiddish or if you will, Middle High German, derivation for the word usually assumed to be of Italian origin.

An interesting sidelight of the struggle between Yiddish and Hebrew is indicated in S. Noble's "Sacred and Secular in the Language of Yiddish Bible Translation." Here we see how individuals whose task it was to render the Holy Scriptures into Yiddish felt that every day *mamaloshen* was not an adequate mechanism with which to express the exaltation of the text. They therefore employed in some

instances an archaic and high-sounding terminology. Critics of the present Yivo are apt to criticize the institution for employing a Yiddish which is another type of departure from the simple and unsophisticated language of our grandparents. The value of Leibush Lehrer's otherwise interesting contribution entitled "The Jewish Elements in the Psychology of the Jewish Child in America" is marred by the inadequacy of the examples chosen and, more particularly, by the fact that a good percentage of the subjects make their identification with the Jewish community on the basis of the Yiddish spoken in their homes. Though this article was published some time ago (1932), it is reasonable to assume that Yiddish was already on a sufficient decline so that the author must have neglected certain other types in the community when he chose his cases. And of course the real problem in the psychology of the Jewish child is found among the products of those thousands of families who are only marginally Jewish.

So much for the Yiddishistic special pleading. The second point of view strongly represented in this collection is usually subsumed under the term "Diaspora Nationalism." Many Yivo adherents were of the opinion that Jews could build for themselves a complete and satisfying Jewish existence in the Diaspora communities which were heavily populated by their own kin and which were surrounded by other nationalities who wished their own independent cultural life. In addition to the construction of a new Yiddish, studies were designed to touch on all phases of Jewish life, both contemporary and historical. These would illuminate both the pathways and the trails on which is to be found the pulsating life of the Jewish masses. This trend is illustrated in articles such as Liebman Hersch's "Jewish and Non-Jewish Criminality in Poland, 1932-1937," and Jacob Lestchinsky's "The Jews in the Cities of the Republic of Poland" (this

last author is of course not a "Diaspora Nationalist").

Two interesting and excellent articles which can be included in this division are Jacob Shatzky's "An Attempt at Jewish Colonization in the Kingdom of Poland," and Raphael Mahler's "The Social and Political Aspects of the Haskalah in Galicia." In both of these contributions the authors stress the role of economic and social classes and the materialistic analysis in determining the trend of history. This type of interpretation is comparatively recent in the Jewish field.

Other historical articles of interest include Elias Tcherikower's "Jewish Martyrology and Jewish Historiography" in which the author, apparently in preparation for the effort the Yivo was later to make in collecting the record of Jewish suffering during World War II, quotes an exclamation of the sixteenth century Samuel Usque:

Europe, Europe, my inferno in earth! What shall I say concerning thee? Thou hast crowned thy victories with my dead bodies. How shall I praise thee, sinful, warlike Italy? Like a whelp of lions thou has devoured the corpses of my sheep. And ye corrupting meadows of France—my lambs have pastured on your poisonous herbs! Thou haughty, reckless, mountainous Germany—from the giddiest heights of the wild Alps thou hast cast my children to the abyss! . . . And thou, sanctimonious, brutal and blood-thirsty Spain—in thy realm ravenous wolves have devoured my flocks.

As previously mentioned, the point of view represented by many of the individuals connected with the organization resulted in an interest in folklore, particularly of the secular variety. Samuel Zanzvel Pipe's "Napoleon in Jewish Folklore," has two delightful excerpts which bear reproduction:

Napoleon slept little. When asked why he slept so little, he replied: "I am Napoleon only when awake. When asleep, I am like everyone else."

Napoleon was short of stature. Once he wanted to take down a map from a high shelf and could not reach it. "By your leave, Majesty," his adjutant said, "I will take it down for you;

I am bigger." "You are not bigger," Napoleon corrected him; "you are longer."

So much for those studies which bear directly upon Yivo's interest in "Diaspora Nationalism." A further development of the organization has been in the field of psychology. All other Jewish institutions have neglected this subject, and only a number of Jewish organizations together with the work of the late Kurt Levin have done things of value. In this collection we find A. A. Golomb's essay "Jewish Self-Hatred." He approaches the subject from a different viewpoint in that he demonstrates that "Jewish" Jews and well-known Zionists may have a touch of the same neurosis (albeit in different form) that plagues their more assimilated brethren. The Yivo has been particularly efficient in its use of the life history technique. Interesting data on the emotional orientation of the Jewish immigrant is suggested in the brief sketch by Moses Kligsberg which utilizes this method entitled "Socio-Psychological Problems Reflected in the Yivo Autobiography Contest."

We must point out that the Yivo approach is responsible for a certain one-sidedness in this volume. Of course the entire subject of Hebrew is dealt with only *en passant*. Since other institutions publish on this subject the deficiency is not serious. It is interesting to note the approach of Yivo to a related problem, Zionism. Most individuals of the group had little faith in the Palestine experiment, but its importance in present-day Jewish life has compelled them to turn the spotlight of social investigation to the East. However the one article that deals with this problem, "Jewish School Systems in Palestine" by Nathan Goldberg, covers the same ground less extensively than several other recent publications. This author has done excellent research in other fields of Jewish social science. Certainly the Yivo could do more original work on the Palestinian problem if it is so minded.

One must make a criticism of the material in this volume which relates to the American scene. Of course, the men of the Institute are presently re-orienting some of their work in line with the needs of the community. They have also added a number of fine scholars who are either American-born or American trained. We might expect therefore that this volume published in English would see the best type of research that has been done on the domestic Jewish scene. Instead (I exclude for the moment the Kligsberg and Lehrer articles already touched upon), the contribution of a Hillel director, Meyer Greenberg, is certainly pedestrian. His work is entitled "The Jewish Student at Yale: His Attitude Toward Judaism," and the questionnaire and statistical approach used in this study has been employed by graduate students and others several times previously in studying this subject. I suppose the topic is a popular one because of the ease with which respondents can be obtained. Let us reproduce Greenberg's conclusion:

There can be no question that a student who has no knowledge of Jewish practice either from home environment or from education will not merely have a neutral attitude toward Judaism but in the great majority of cases will definitely tend toward negative attitudes, toward the disparagement of Jewish values and dissociation from Jewish life. On the other hand, those who have Jewish knowledge, and especially those who come from observant homes and are themselves observant Jews, are far more likely to believe in the worthwhileness of Jewish survival and of continued adherence to Jewish principles. The future of organized Jewish life will have to depend primarily upon the strengthening of observance, especially in the home, and secondly upon the improvement of the vehicles of Jewish education.

Certainly there is nothing startling in this conclusion nor is there any serious suggestion of ways and means which might be utilized to improve the attitude of the Jewish college student.³ Nahum

³ For something more helpful which uses a "dynamic" approach see Simon Herman, "A social Study in Zionism," *The New Palestine*, Vol. XXXVII, No. 20. (June 20, 1947).

N. Glatzer's excellent work, "Franz Rosenzweig" at least shows how one Jewish intellectual fought his way back to his people. The approach typified by this individual may well offer some hints for the future. The rest of the volume consists of a sensitive contribution, more poetic than scientific, by Abraham Heschel "The Eastern European Era in Jewish History;" and "The Jewish Ghetto of the Past" by Toni Oelsner.

To the scientific thinker who has thirsted for a social science in Judaica, this volume comes as an indicator of real progress. The Yiddish Scientific Institute has incorporated in this Annual some of its richest thinking, its finest research. It has planted the seed for greater work in the social sciences. But this is only the beginning. The germination which is to follow, and the maturation which is the objective, depend entirely upon the realization by the Jewish community of the need for this important field in Jewish academic study.



Woman in Subway JOSHUA Z. HOLLAND

A Boy from Germany

By BENJAMIN WEINTROUB

I DREADED SOMEWHAT the experience ahead of me; I was to meet another victim of Hitler. I have met many refugees from Germany and, of late, Jews mostly. All had a tale of persecution to relate under Nazi domination. The more reserved of the immigrants spoke of their experiences only with great reluctance. And even the more demonstrative of the refugees, in telling their experiences in concentration camps, often paused suddenly as if the narrator were recalling incidents impossible to describe.

It was never possible wholly to dismiss any of these men and women, so overwhelming was the catastrophe that had maimed and uprooted them from their homes. As their number grew, however, and the pattern of their experiences tended to repeat itself, one accepted them as a matter of course, and applied himself prosaically to the problems of meeting their demands. This, I assume, is the attitude of the attendants in the receiving station of a hospital in times of an epidemic: an important duty impersonally discharged in routine fashion.

That evening I was to meet a refugee, a boy from Germany. I had met other children from that blighted country, boys and girls, mute in the presence of their elders, and I dreaded the occasion ahead of me because a boy alone was to be the central figure. I girded myself for an ordeal. A boy barely fourteen was hardly a competent reporter and, besides, my German was extremely poor—an interview with a youth who spoke no English was hardly an experience to welcome. Nevertheless I went.

The boy, Stanley Greenbaum, was the

nephew of a local business and political leader. The boy came from somewhere in unoccupied France, and I had heard an amazing story of the effort required to extricate him from the clutches of Nazidom. Familiar in its main essentials, the saga of the boy's deliverance involved endless affidavits to consuls in Europe, statements to Washington, a trip via Clipper from Lisbon, and a series of torturing intervals of suspense before the completion of his Odyssey. Still, I felt a glow of satisfaction that his worries were over, and that a new environment would soon obliterate the horror of the preceding years.

His uncle, Meyer Greenbaum, was a contractor—large, slow, but active in both politics and the religious life of the community. He was pugnaciously Jewish; the reports of Hitler's relentless persecution of Jewry Meyer Greenbaum took as a perennial insult. He never tired of discussing the plight of the Jew and the means to alleviate conditions. Hitler, to him, was a living, active enemy, who obsessed the contractor at all hours, whose malignancy could not be ignored and whose treatment of the Jews was his constant concern.

Stanley was the son of a brother of his, who, like Meyer, had run away from Russia on the eve of induction into military service; Joseph settled in Germany while Meyer went to America. The brother's correspondence was irregular but Meyer learned that Joseph had prospered in Munich and was of some consequence in the shoe industry of the city. In the early days of Hitler's power Joseph wrote briefly referring but casually to the chief Nazi, and that in contemptuous terms.

Later Meyer learned from others that Joseph had lost his business in Munich and that together with his wife he had "committed suicide." Also that a son remained. It was two years since then and about two weeks since the boy's arrival in America. For two years Meyer sought to wrest the boy from the clutches of Nazidom. It was Meyer against Hitler, the Jew against the Nazis, and the eventual rescue was something of a racial triumph.

Tonight's affair was the celebration of an event—the crowning of Meyer's efforts. The boy himself, it would seem, was less important than the occasion.

There were perhaps fifty people in the Greenbaum home when I got there. Many stayed briefly and left after a handshake with Meyer and a smile at the boy. A number remained, and grouped themselves around the uncle and the nephew. The boy sat behind a small table, and Meyer loomed over him, an expansive smile upon his face. Greatly elated over the endless stream of callers, he was never forgetful of his duties as host.

"Rebecca," he would say when the crowd around the boy became too large, "why don't you buy the fellows a drink?" And Mrs. Greenbaum, plump, blonde, and obedient, dutifully waved a glass or a bottle and called on the guests to wish the boy a welcome to America.

Then came surprised exclamations from Meyer Greenbaum's side of the room. I was toasting the boy with Dr. Morton Lewis, and warmly complimenting Mrs. Greenbaum upon her husband's choice of Scotch.

"Who would believe that," Mrs. Rosen was saying, "the boy speaks perfect English!"

Mrs. Rosen was the wife of Benjamin Rosen, Rabbi, and her voice would have carried—and it did—in large auditoriums. The smile on Meyer's face became larger. His eyes were dancing, and his face radiated good will.

"I knew it all along," he said, "he speaks fine English!"

"Ask him something, Rabbi Rosen," Dr. Lewis said, "ask him how he likes this country."

Rabbi Rosen, thin, dark, and bespectacled, repeated the question Stanley must have heard.

"I like it fine," the boy said, "America is a great country."

Since most of us, despite Mrs. Greenbaum's protestations, had crowded toward the boy's corner, Stanley got up. His uncle loomed near him, large, protective, and benign. There was little resemblance between the two, but there could be little mistake that the boy welcomed the friendship lavished upon him by his relative. He moved closer to him when Meyer laid his hand on his shoulder. Stanley was tall, with small, regular features, and when he rose there was an erectness in his pose that spoke of military training. His hands automatically came to rest, rigidly, at his sides.

"Tell him not to be so stiff," someone giggled behind us.

The boy looked directly and unsmilingly ahead, and Meyer frowned slightly.

Rabbi Rosen coughed a little.

"We are all pleased to know that you speak English," he said; "Who taught it to you?"

"My mother," the boy answered, with the directness of one who responds to a command, "and then I learned more at school."

Mrs. Greenbaum sniffled audibly, and a number of handkerchiefs appeared in the hands of several women.

Rabbi Rosen coughed again.

"Thank God this is a free country," he said. "We are all free and equal . . ."

"No," the boy said.

The reply was sharp, surprisingly unexpected.

Dr. Rosen said, "It is a free country. We have a Constitution . . . a Bill of

Rights . . . We are all equal . . . Jews and Gentiles."

Erect and unwavering as if on parade, the boy replied, "The Jew is not the equal of the German. The Jew has no Nordic blood in his veins. The Aryan comes from a superior race. Only the Aryan's blood is pure."

It was very still in the room. Meyer Greenbaum removed his hand from his nephew's shoulder. Instead, that hand, large and clenched into a fist, lay on the small table beside the boy. Meyer's shoulders, too, were stooped, and his pose reminded one of a wrestler's about to meet his opponent.

"But that's not so, my boy," Rabbi Rosen said patiently. "It is the opinion of the entire scientific world that the Nazis' claim of racial purity is nonsense. And," he added, raising his voice, "no Nazi may claim a thousandth part of the contribution to culture and civilization that the Jew may justly boast of. Remember that, sonny."

And in the same loud and yet colorless voice, Stanley said:

"It is said in *Mein Kampf*: All that civilization is, all of its advance, is the work of the Nordic race. The Jew is the eternal parasite. Only those of the pure blood, the Aryans, may be the carriers of culture. It is said in *Mein Kampf*. . ."

"God damn Hitler," Meyer Greenbaum suddenly roared, "God damn him a million times!"

The boy dismayed and disturbed, suddenly pathetically helpless in spite of his firm military bearing, turned his head toward his uncle. An unspoken, painful inquiry struggled in the child's eyes. And then the question died and the boy remained silent.

The uncle's hand, large and protecting, wrapped itself around Stanley's shoulders.

"It will be all right," he said, a menacing promise in his voice. "We shall teach you. You are . . . we are all now in America."

The boy stood quiet, unsmiling, self-possessed, his eyes upon the old man.

The greatest of living Czechoslovaks, the first act in his life to bring him prominence was an investigation which proved a set of documents hallowed and revered by the Czech and Slovak peoples to be forgeries. A Roman Catholic who turned Protestant, he gained early distinction by defending a Jew wrongfully accused of an obscure ritual murder. He exposed as fabrications of the Austrian foreign office the documents in the Friedjung case which ruined what was then his official career; but this occasion made him a hero of the oppressed Slavic peoples. Dominating his life have been two factors, faith in Czechoslovakia and the pursuit of truth.

JOHN GUNTHER on Masaryk (*Inside Europe*)

Easy Does It

By MAXWELL H. GOLDBERG

IN THIS ARTICLE, I propose to trace and evaluate a pattern of social relationships that has developed, during the past twenty-five or thirty years, at a comparatively small but growing New England college—recently renamed the University of Massachusetts, and located in Amherst. My effort should prove useful; for the tone and the trend of social relationships in a given community are likely to be revealed most clearly and decisively through assessment of the status of its minority groups and the quality of their common life.

My story, like the classical epics, starts *in medias res*—in the middle thirties, for that was a memorable period in the history of Jewish student life at our university. On all sides we were then hearing gloomy voices about the present and the future of the American Jew. A noted rabbi, Dr. Abraham J. Feldman, now President of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, was then warning a hundred Jewish students, representing most of the colleges and universities in the Connecticut Valley region of Massachusetts and Connecticut, that, in spite of the apparent progress toward national recovery from the depression, the streams of anti-Semitism in our country were still swelling. The vast shadow of this threat fell upon the American college campus. It was disturbing to have this shadow reported from privately endowed institutions of higher learning. It was even more disturbing to have it reported from the supposed citadels of American democracy—the state colleges and universities.

This was a time when, at some American colleges, Jewish organizations—fraternal, religious, cultural, social—were

being frowned upon or directly banned. It was in such a general atmosphere that our local Jewish student club—religious and cultural—had its inception. Yet our Jewish students did not have to agitate for official sanction of the embryonic organization, of which students were to become members as soon as they designated themselves as Jews and indicated an interest in joining.

Rabbi Harry Kaplan, then of Pittsfield, Massachusetts, but now Director of the great Hillel Foundation at Ohio State University, did much to prepare the way for this organization. Dr. Ralph Harlow, Professor of Religion at Smith College, and Dr. J. Paul Williams, then religious director at the University of Massachusetts, but now Professor of Religion at Mount Holyoke College, likewise did much to stimulate enthusiasm for the club, and to bring it into being. Several interested Jewish students provided energetic leadership. But what was especially significant, in the light of the unfavorable temper of the times, was that no agitation, no pressure, was needed to secure official recognition of the club. On the contrary, the faculty religious advisory committee welcomed it; and the authorities encouraged it. They commissioned me to guide its growth.

Here, then, was something that seemed to run counter to the commonly held notion that Jewish cultural and religious organizations cohere only under stress of struggle against combined hostile forces pressing upon them from without. Though far from living up to all of its ideals and realizing all its aims, our club not only kept holding its own, but also kept gaining in strength and prestige. To be sure,

favorable campus factors outside the Jewish group itself and favorable Jewish factors from outside the campus both played a real part in this process. Thus, the aid given us by Rabbi Milton Steinberg and by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations—in particular by Judge Solomon Elsner, Lewis Fox, Rabbi Gustave Falk, Rabbi Saul Habas, and Rabbi Maurice Zigmond—was invaluable.

Yet, without detracting from the worth of these other factors, we must emphasize that a fundamental impetus to this adaptive and integrative growth came from within the local Jewish student group. It came from an important local tradition established over a period of about two decades by the few Jewish students at the university before the large increase of Jewish student enrollment during the 'thirties.

There was a positive ideal that motivated our Jewish undergraduates of the pioneer generations at this institution, and that they more or less consciously tried to approximate. In their minds was the image of the courteous considerate young American Jew of dignity and worth. He was a young man of poise and tact. He had *Menschlichkeit*. He was one who commanded the respect of others because, first of all, through creative participation in his own Jewish tradition and the contemporary Jewish life, he knew himself historically and immediately; and this sympathetic knowledge gave him self-confidence and self-respect.

Without being servile or hypocritical, he tried to be gracious. Without being profuse, he expressed his heart-felt appreciation of acts of genuine good-will and uncondescending friendliness on the part of non-Jews. Without being over-assertive, he eagerly participated in programs involving cooperation with non-Jewish groups. Without being mean about it, he frowned upon the word "tolerance" as suggesting the enduring of one group, supposedly inferior, by another group, supposedly superior. But he worked hard

for mutual respect. He tried to dismiss from his mind, as fruitless, the frequently mooted question of the alleged mental superiority of Jews over other people; but he zealously sought to maintain his own integrity and self-respect.

The love and practice of total integrity and reasonableness as thus conceived was, in the opinion of the pioneer students at our university, far from being a mere frill. It was essential to that sustained effort at combatting anti-Jewish feeling to which their leaders daily admonished them. Yet it was more than an agent of expediency. When fully understood, in its historic context and its ethical milieu, it was revealed to be a direct consequence of loyalty to those traditional moral values which are central to the soul of Judaism, and which are tersely summed up in the famous precept from the Book of Micah: "It hath been told thee, O Man, what is good, and what the Lord doth require of thee: Only to do justly, and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God." Or, in the Sage Hillel's: "What thou wouldst not have done unto thee, do not unto thy neighbor."

II. Evaluation

Has this dynamic been effective? The question reminds me of a meeting that was held at our neighboring Smith College, about six years after the establishment of the Jewish Club on our campus. The purpose was to discuss, with Prof. Ralph Harlow, and with Dr. Abram Leon Sachar, Judge Solomon Elsner, of Hartford, Rabbi Maurice Zigmond, now newly appointed Director of the Hillel Foundation at Harvard, and other Jewish leaders, the feasibility and desirability of setting up a Hillel agency for the Jewish college students in the Western Massachusetts section of the Connecticut Valley.

During the talk, a student representative of the University of Massachusetts asked Dr. Sachar what Hillel had to offer them, in Amherst. Dr. Sachar replied in traditional Jewish fashion. He put another

question: "Well, what do you have at present?" The student answered, by pointing out, first, that they had a faculty adviser and counselor, and by describing, next, the operations of the club. She named its major committees, its typical activities, and its special projects. When she was finished, Dr. Sachar smiled and replied that, so far as he could see, the students at the University of Massachusetts were already getting Hillel service—and without a paid director.

Actually, of course, there was a great deal more that Hillel might bring to the Jewish students in Amherst. They were ready for much more intensive Jewish cultural and religious experience and education than the club, to date, had been able to stimulate in the local Jewish student community. Nevertheless, Dr. Sachar's gracious remark did wittily suggest how far the club had come since its inception. It had strengthened its base. It had grown according to clearly defined comprehensive plan; it had all the essential functions, and they were healthy.

Hence it was that when, in January 1941, a Hillel Counselorship, administered by Rabbi Judah Cahn, was provided for the Jewish students in Amherst, it moved into a substantial heritage upon which it could immediately draw. It did not have to start from scratch to create a spirit, build up morale, develop an organizational structure, establish a tradition. It found all of these vigorously present and operative—eager for further development. From now on, the growth of the club was to be within a national framework; and it was to derive energy from national sources. Yet its local grass-roots vigor, achieved through several decades, remained a primary source of its strength.

Another way of gauging the effectiveness of the dynamic that I have sketched is to consider the student leadership that it fostered and then sent on to the general Jewish community. This is an individualized qualitative test. Subjected to it, our club of the formative decades at

the University of Massachusetts again emerges very creditably.

For example, there is Florence Bilsky Mazer, who, following her graduation from the University, became increasingly active in the life of her Jewish community, and who, this past year, has been President of the Sisterhood Temple Beth El, in Springfield, Massachusetts. She was one of the first leaders of our club; and, as such, she did a great deal to make it internally sound, and to interpret its ideals sympathetically to the rest of our academic community.

Then there is Lawrence Levinson. As student cantor, he conducted the Friday evening worship service with a fervor and a gusto that used to warm our hearts. His welcoming in of the Sabbath as a beauteous bride, his *Sholem Aleichem*, his blessing of the wine, his final "Gut' Shabbes"—all were contagiously enthusiastic. Later, as bombardier in the Army Air Forces, he was shot down over Italy, and was consigned to a German prisoner-of-war camp. Making no attempt to conceal his allegiance to the "Mosaic faith," he here became a strong morale builder—especially for his Jewish fellow-prisoners. He became a lay chaplain to them; and he heartened them through worship services conducted with that zest and enthusiasm characteristic of him as student cantor in Amherst.

I recall, also, three other leaders of our Jewish club at the University of Massachusetts—two of them past presidents; all of them qualitative evidence of the value of the organization as a proving ground for future Jewish leadership, and all of them illustrations of the vitality of this cultural organism as an endogenous growth. Their names are Albert Yanow, Herbert Weiner, and Milton Weissberg. They have followed similar postgraduate careers. They have gone on into studies for the rabbinate and have successfully completed these studies. Two of them have served Hillel—Rabbi Weiner, while still a student, as an assistant director; Rabbi

Yanow, as director. The latter has served, also, as a chaplain in the United States Navy. Rabbi Weissberg, too, may soon be a naval chaplain. His participation in an interfaith experiment of a single house of worship to be used, at different times, by Catholics, Protestants, and Jews in a community of limited worship facilities has been favorably written up in the *New York Times*.

Both Rabbi Yanow and Rabbi Weiner are now studying at the Hebrew University; and they are devoting most of their extra-curricular time and energy to Zionist work. Rabbi Yanow's letters home, describing his experiences as volunteer worker in the crucial operations of setting up new colonies in the Negev have been published in the *Jewish Advocate* of Boston. They are vivid and vigorous testimonials to the impetus toward creative Jewish life which he derived from his experiences as leader of the Jewish student club here at the University of Massachusetts.

Herbert Weiner's consistent winning of prizes and scholarships for his advanced studies offers similar testimonial. So does the comment made to me by Dr. Shalom Spiegel, under whom both these young men pursued advanced studies. At the end of the conversation that followed my introduction to this distinguished scholar, he observed to me that the meeting had afforded him double pleasure: he had enjoyed the chat itself; also, he had been glad to meet, personally, the teacher of two of his superior students. He went on to explain that he had found Yanow and Weiner outstanding for their intellectual breadth and their moral stamina.

I was gratified to hear this comment. Yet I was sure that the qualities singled out for praise were in great part inherent within the two past presidents of our Jewish club; and that other educational forces than I had been mainly responsible for their accomplishments. And among these other forces, one of the strongest, I believed, was the club itself, in which

they had worked and studied, and which had drawn out their potentialities.

By way of conclusion, I wish to report another, indication of the efficacy, on our campus, of the cultural dynamic that I have been evaluating. A year ago last spring, one of my nieces, Janet Z. Shoenberg, then a sophomore at the University of Massachusetts, called on me to say good-bye on her way home for the summer vacation. She reminded me how, before she had applied for entrance into the university, I had urged her to consider other institutions, where, I thought, she might more advantageously pursue her special scholastic interests. She then went on to assure me thus: "Uncle Max, I'm not only not sorry that I came here. I'm really glad I came!"

I replied that I was pleased to know that. Then I asked why she was so glad. Her answer, which, much to my regret, I cannot recall verbatim, went somewhat as follows:

"Here, I feel it is normal to be Jewish, and to be affiliated with Jewish organizations. I've been learning that the situation is quite different on other campuses. On some of them, the Jewish students seem to be embarrassed when they are openly identified with Jewish groups, and the non-Jewish students see to it that they feel embarrassment, by the tones they use when they refer to the Jewish organizations or their members. Here, well, it's simply taken for granted that the Jewish students are affiliated with their groups; and the groups are referred to naturally, with the assumption that they merit friendliness and respect.

"For example, the other day our sophomore honorary society was discussing freshmen to be selected as next year's members. When a Catholic girl was mentioned, a Catholic sophomore was questioned about her activities in the Newman Club; and something similar was done when a Protestant girl was being discussed. And when a Jewish girl was being considered, the members just naturally

and normally turned to me and asked me about her activities in our Jewish groups.

"That's what I like about it. They take it for granted that it is right and good for us Jewish students to be active in our Jewish groups. They assume that such interest and activity make the student a much more valuable member of the whole college. They don't resent it as something setting us apart. They don't regard it as socially undesirable. They assume that the Jewish organizations are worth their respect.

"That's part of why I'm glad I came here."

I want to emphasize that this comment was altogether impromptu and unsolicited. It came spontaneously, in the course of casual family talk. I therefore valued it so much the more highly. For, to me, it was a kind of informal, case-history "Q. E. D." to the experiment in adaptive, integrative, yet autonomous growth which we pioneer students of the formative decades undertook in the 'twenties and early 'thirties, when the first filaments were being fashioned in what was to become a normal and wholesome pattern of social relationships among our Jewish students themselves and between them and their non-Jewish fellows.

The separate filaments, as well as the whole pattern, have survived the war crisis, and have emerged strengthened. The Jewish cultural and religious club of the 'thirties is now a vigorous B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation. It boasts the largest membership in the history of such an organization at our university. Under the effective direction of Rabbi Louis Ruchames, it has been happily functioning in its own home, secured through the generous support of the B'nai B'rith Lodges of Western Massachusetts. It is an integral part of the college community and the campus life. Its members feel normal. They have experienced, successfully, the adaptive, integrative, yet internally individualized growth which it has been the main purpose of this article to portray.

To minority groups at other colleges and universities—especially at other "country colleges"—they are a quiet, unspectacular example, heartening in our troubled times, of successful democratic ecology on the American campus: a demonstration that, at least in college communities, cultural pluralism may be made to work—and with gratifying results—over a long period of years.

Anti-Semitism is the corollary and catch-word of present-day mass humanity and mass mysticism, both obscure characteristics and shot through with much bestiality. It is not a thought, nor a word; it has no human voice, it is mere bawling.

THOMAS MANN, in *Opinion*, May, 1937

Gentlemen, This Is My Speech:

By SELWYN S. SCHWARTZ

Tonight, gentlemen, your menu is memory.
Nearest us, death, the vaulted fear of
A generation. The hour, an instant note
Flings to the wind. Gentlemen, a ghost
Knows the lunar change.

It may not please you all, despite the roar,
To emulate Grandfather's skull in each scene.
But the tear in each eye an
Eternal stillness, while the wind indicative
Through his hair, and death, a regal shoe.

This you know, gentlemen;
They came with laws
Of clowns with daily miracles
Of glorified painted whims—
The Goliath-of-all Radio.

And memory a faithful target
Dispossessed of fear; morning,
A tattooed scene of adventitious
Gloom.

His eyes like broken chords,
Mile after mile through crippled space.
His hat in the wind a strange lantern,
As he drank his tear, the neon of sun,
And sang a voyage on the floor
With fingers like cold keys.

And each gas chamber door, a sharp phrase:
Sorrow, as you know, is Christ-old.
Cool thoughts testify, but the cold sound
Clinging to all the heights assumes mastery:
Now, the earth is the size of you and me!
The size of an egg,
The size of our generation.

MIDWESTERN COMMENTARY

by

ELMER GERTZ

ELIZABETH WOOD IS MUCH TOO YOUNG TO be called the Jane Addams of our day; but increasingly one hears her described in such terms. This great and charming woman is the executive secretary of the Chicago Housing Authority and, as such, she has borne the brunt of an attack which is being conducted with mounting fury by those who don't like the CHA's policy of non-discrimination. There are many respectable bigots in Chicago; some of them hold high places in the political and civic life of the city. They are gunning for Miss Wood and her energetic, sincere, and able assistant, Milton F. Shufro. They want to establish a policy of completely segregated housing, the perpetuation of the Black Ghettos. Some of them go beyond this; they want no public funds spent for such "nonsense" as decent housing for those unable to pay a fair rent. Miss Wood and her cohorts do not yield to such unholy pressure. But how long they will be permitted to hold out is a question. The city administration must be reminded constantly that there is real community support for Elizabeth Wood.

I was privileged recently to attend one such manifestation of the affectionate regard with which Miss Wood is held by the colored people of Chicago. Every outstanding Negro of the city, of every political belief and every walk of life, joined in the sponsorship of a testimonial banquet, honoring not only Miss Wood,

but her assistant, Milton F. Shufro, and that gallant director of the Mayor's Commission on Human Relations, Mr. Thomas H. Wright. It will be well if others make known their determination that the Chicago Housing Authority and the Mayor's Commission on Human Relations be permitted to function in the spirit of the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights.

—□—□—□—

THE EVENT WHICH PRECIPITATED THE AGITATION pro and con these two city agencies was the Fernwood Park racial imbroglio. It will be remembered that while Mayor Edward J. Kelly was at the city helm, a few deserving Negro veterans were moved into the Airport Homes veterans' housing project. This precipitated a stormy reaction on the part of the neighborhood, which almost culminated in a bloody riot. Only the determination of the Housing Authority and the Mayor's Commission on Human Relations and the firmness of former Mayor Kelly prevented a disaster. Their victory was a Pyrrhic one; for today, I believe, there are no Negro veterans at Airport Homes.

Then, after Martin H. Kennelly became Mayor, there was a repetition of the Airport Homes situation, and again the city was on the verge of a race riot. This time Fernwood Park was the scene of the difficulty, when a small group of Negro veterans were moved into the

temporary housing project. The excitement has subsided now; the Negro families are still at Fernwood Park. But one has the feeling that we are experiencing simply an armed truce. Fears have been expressed, too, that the episode will continue to undermine a solution of Chicago's grave housing problem.

—□—□—□—

THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE, JOHN Prendergast, has said that Chicago will have no race riots. He has said that for a long while, and he has almost been wrong. Unlike the Park Police, who, curiously enough, are autonomous, the city police receive no special training in what is euphemistically called human relations. Commissioner Prendergast has resisted the request that he institute the proper in-training program. We can only hope that he will yield before a race riot compels more drastic measures.

—□—□—□—

ANOTHER PUBLIC SERVANT, NOW AT THE beginning of his career in Chicago, was greeted recently with expressions of approval and hope. About sixty civic organizations joined with the Citizens School Committee in hailing Mr. Harold C. Hunt, the new Superintendent of Schools, at a well attended luncheon. Mr. Hunt impressed all of us by his sincerity and ability and, above all, by his salesmanship. There is the general feeling that he knows what democracy is, and that to him it encompasses students, teachers, and parents of every race, color, and creed. It may very well be that Chicago faces a great educational future. The Mayor has stressed that he will permit Mr. Hunt full scope, except, of course, where the public interest may require otherwise.

—□—□—□—

THE CHICAGO COUNCIL AGAINST RACIAL AND Religious Discrimination suggests that this community ought to salute the First

Baptist Church of Chicago for employing a Japanese American as its principal minister; the Illinois Bell Telephone Company for hiring Negro telephone girls, and the Urban League for persuading it to do so; Archbishop Ritter of St. Louis for threatening excommunication for those misguided Catholics agitating to compel the exclusion of Negroes from parochial schools; K. A. M. Temple on its first century; Dr. Harold W. Ruopp of Central Church for his gallant defense of minority people. I would add that we ought to salute Dr. Homer A. Jack, of the Chicago Council Against Discrimination, for his ceaseless fight against the bigots of this community. Dr. Jack has courage and perseverance. He is on the spot, with Tom Wright, whenever there is need to defend human rights—which means every hour of every day.

—□—□—□—

BY NOW THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO course on Intergroup Tensions will have been completed. Mr. A. A. Liveright, former director of the American Council on Race Relations, conducted the course. Gunner Myrdal's classic, *An American Dilemma*, was the text. The course concerned itself with such questions as:

Who are our allies and who our enemies in dealing with discrimination? Can certain minorities work more effectively alone or is joint action always advisable?

Where should primary emphasis be placed? On a long-term education program or additional research? On national policy and legislation? On community action? In the employment, housing, social service, health or social front?

Should major emphasis be placed on influencing accepted community leaders or on mass action?

How can the work of various groups be more effectively integrated?

—□—□—□—

I WAS MUCH INTERESTED IN READING THE plans for an open forum sponsored by the Central YMCA Adult Education program, a sort of town meeting of the loop, to be conducted by ordinary Chicagoans who

want to air their views in open competition with others. Remembering the incidents which gave rise to the revolt of the old YMCA college faculty, I am hopeful that the forum remembers that the necessary corollary of a free exchange of views is a policy of non-discrimination.

—□—□—□—

IN A WORLD TORN WITH STRIFE AND WITH the ominous promise of bigger wars to come, it was heartening to read of the arrival in Chicago of several young European theological students, part of a group of 30 who will study at 13 seminaries in this country under a scholarship program of the World Council of Churches. The group was selected by interdenominational reconstruction committees in nine countries. The Chicago arrivals are from Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Norway, and Germany.

—□—□—□—

ROOSEVELT COLLEGE LIKEWISE ARRANGED A series of lectures on race relations, under the co-sponsorship of the Chicago Council Against Racial and Religious Discrimination. In the same spirit was a nine-session course at the Sheil School of Social Studies. The more numerous such lectures, the better the situation will be, particularly if the right persons are attracted. By the right persons, I mean what Judge Joseph Drucker may have had in mind when he sentenced some of the young vandals of the Fernwood Park housing disorders to attend a series of talks on human values. Some of the parents were enraged that their youngsters—chips off the old bigoted blocks—had to be subjected to so enlightening an experience. God forbid that they should learn to love all members of the human race!

—□—□—□—

AFTER MANY DELAYS AND MUCH ORATORY, the City Council finally passed the revised anti-riot ordinance (originally proposed by Alderman Benjamin Becker)

which penalizes those who incite the clear and present danger of an attack on persons or property because of race, religion, or national origin. The ordinance, of course, is a fine thing—if it is enforced, and if it works. Would it have prevented the Airport Homes or Fernwood Park disorders? The point that I desire to make is that no ordinance by itself accomplishes a purpose. It must be implemented by a vigilant community. Let's not forget that.

—□—□—□—

IT IS GOOD TO KNOW THAT THE ANTI-Defamation League has openly joined those who are fighting housing discrimination. It intends to intervene before the U. S. Supreme Court urging invalidation of restrictive covenants. (There are three such cases there now. The Court allowed *certiorari* in a District of Columbia Case). ADL is not going to stop with filing a brief. It intends to go all-out in its campaign.

It can count on the cooperation of the American Jewish Committee, I believe, and the American Jewish Congress. Byron Miller, of the latter organization, has just completed a survey of all the relevant law and has come up with some novel ideas which will be reflected in the Congress brief to be filed with the Supreme Court.

By the time the next issue of the CHICAGO JEWISH FORUM appears, we may have a ruling by the highest court.

—□—□—□—

I HOPE THAT ALL MY READERS (ASSUMING that I have a few) have noticed the series currently appearing in the *Chicago Times*, under the heading, *Life in Our Town*. The foreign correspondent, Keith Wheeler, writes the articles, which deal with the many peoples constituting the American people, the nations within our nation. The article before me deals with the Polish language press. There is an interview with Father Mitchell Starzynski,

who edits the *Polish Daily News*. The sports section of that publication is printed in English, and Father Starzynski is afraid that the whole paper may some day be printed in the English language.

"Still," says the priest, "I seem to remember Polish editors voicing the same prophecy 25 years ago. We're still selling 25,000 copies daily and our neighbor and competitor *Zgoda* does about the same. Possibly I'm just manufacturing a bogey that doesn't exist."

As Wheeler points out, Polish is still widely spoken as the home language of Chicago's 600,000 Polish-Americans, and, as he says, "other old world customs and traditions exhibit a stubborn survival power that defies new world modernity."

—□—□—□—

WE HAVE ALREADY REFERRED TO THE 100TH anniversary of K. A. M. Temple. Instead of an empty pageant of some sort, Rabbis

Jacob J. Weinstein and Eric Friedland decided upon an institute on faith in the modern world, in the form of a series of weekly discussions in conjunction with Temple services. In addition to such distinguished clergymen as Rabbis Weinstein, Friedland, Dr. Maurice Eisendrath, Dr. Abram Cronbach, Dr. Samuel N. Blumenfeld, Rev. Leslie T. Pennington, Dr. Solomon B. Freehof, Dr. Joshua Loth Liebman and, of course, the dean of them all, Dr. Stephen S. Wise, laymen were called in as active participants, among them Waldo Frank and various members of K. A. M. Temple. Some of the subjects discussed were: contemporary man's quest for faith; the answer of liberal Judaism; ritual and prayer, music, study, and social action, as means of common identification; new directions for the second century of K. A. M.; prophecy in the synagogue. Programs like these can well drive a *Shabbas Goy* into the House of God.



A Friendly Game

JOSHUA Z. HOLLAND

NEW YORK NOTES

By VERO

TWO AND A HALF YEARS AGO I had seen many people weep in the streets of New York, I had heard the radio commentator say: "Probably no man in contemporary history had as deep an understanding and conviction that the average little man had definite rights to a decent life. . . ." That was on April 12, 1945, when Franklin D. Roosevelt died. A few weeks ago New York's Little Men again wept in the streets, after having learned that Fiorello LaGuardia had passed away. He himself had been a "Little Man" as far as his background and his stature were concerned. People smiled at his squat, waddling figure, referred to him as "Butch" or called him "The Hat," as he wore ten-gallon hats, black in winter, tan in summer. People would laugh whenever "Little Flower" appeared on a newsreel: his voice would usually crack to falsetto as he tossed back his heavy head and smacked his lips. People would joke about the way their Mayor chased fire engines—but the same people loved and adored that funny little guy, for they knew another LaGuardia, the champion of the rights of America's Forgotten Men.

Three categories of people loathed him, though. First, the stuffed shirts of both major parties, and their capitalistic-minded backers did not care for that sincere and unrelenting reformer. Among them was President Hoover. Said LaGuardia, referring to Hoover and his treatment of the bonus army: "Soup is cheaper than tear bombs, and bread better than bullets in maintaining law

and order in times of depression." Neither did Jimmy Walker, New York's handsome and pleasant, but weak mayor like the ugly little man who was to become his successor. When, at a meeting, some busybody demanded to be heard and Mayor LaGuardia refused, the man shouted: Mayor Walker always let us talk." "That," retorted LaGuardia, "is why I am here and he isn't. You can't be a good mayor and a good fellow." Thirdly, the dictators resented him. Once LaGuardia suggested that the then forthcoming New York World's Fair include in its exhibits a "chamber of horrors" in which there would be "the figure of that brown-shirted fanatic who is now menacing the people of the world." To the Nazi government's outburst of anger, Fiery Fiorello reacted with this comment: "Mr. Hitler's own government was quick to recognize that I meant him. I don't know whether it was his guilty conscience or my power of description."

△ △ △

LA GUARDIA WHO, incidentally, was half-Jewish (his mother's maiden name was Irene Luzzatto Coen) was, in a sense, a victim of World War II like his intimate friend, F. D. R.: both men worked themselves to death for the winning of the war. It has recently been made known that 10,500 American Jews—out of a total 550,000 who served in our Armed Forces—paid with their lives for accomplishing the great task. On a beautiful Saturday,

at the end of October, the first war dead from Europe arrived in New York harbor in the hold of the transport Joseph V. Connolly. At a memorial service in Central Park, chaplains of three faiths prayed for the soldier dead.

I glanced through the list of names with next of kin from New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, and saw the list headed by a Pfc Abrams ("Of course, the Jews are always pushy, they must be the first!" I frequently heard anti-Semites exclaim). I continued reading: "Aronson, Axelrod, Blattman, Bloom, Cohen, Edelstein, Epstein, Feuer, Fogelman. . . ." And I could not help remembering the nasty doggerels circulated by our native Fascists five, six years ago, ridiculing and attacking the "kosher air raid wardens" who let the Christians do the real fighting. . . .

△ △ △

THESE 10,500 AMERICAN JEWS, like their Christian colleagues, at least died holding weapons in their hands. But the vast majority of Europe's Jews were completely unarmed when the Nazis drove them away to the slaughter. It is distressing to learn that the number of those Jewish victims would have been much smaller, had it not been for the narrow-mindedness, if not hostility of certain officials in our own State Department and in Britain's Foreign Office who blocked F. D. R.'s efforts in World War II to get Jews out of German territory and thus save them from the Nazis. It so happened that a Christian friend of mine, a New York editor, drew my attention to an article written for *Collier's* by Henry Morgenthau Jr., which reveals the ghastly story. Mr. Morgenthau indicts members of the State Department for "dodging their grim responsibility, procrastinating when concrete rescue schemes were placed before them . . . suppressing information about atrocities . . . and sometimes what appeared to be calculated

obstructionism." Some of these near-Fascists have been cleared out of their key positions by Secretaries Byrnes and Marshall, but this action does not resuscitate the Jews who might have been smuggled into neutral countries and who, instead, were marched off to Auschwitz and Maidanek. In this article, which has been widely discussed in New York, Mr. Morgenthau also accuses the British Foreign Office of having opposed F. D. R.'s refugee program because it wished to avoid the problem of disposing of these rescued Jews. "There are times when I begin to wonder whether we're really living in the Twentieth Century!" my Christian friend sighed.

△ · △ △

THERE IS NO SENSE in our closing our eyes to facts, however unpleasant they may be. And it is a shocking fact that at least half the people in the U. S. have some racial or religious prejudice, with the greatest hostility directed against Jews! This was disclosed by a recent *Fortune* public opinion poll conducted by Elmo Roper. "An understanding of the considerable extent of American intolerance," *Fortune* comments, "will be sobering to those who talk glibly of melting pots, equality, and the Brotherhood of Man." Hope for minorities, however, is found by *Fortune* in the survey's disclosure that 28 per cent of the people (about 22 million adults) favor strong measures to bring about better treatment of minority, racial and religious groups.

What do these twenty-eight million do to eliminate the obnoxious Quota System at American Colleges? It is both ridiculous and dangerous to deny its existence, as has recently been done in a statement submitted by the Association of Colleges and Universities at a hearing in Albany of the State Commission to Examine Into the Need for a State University. The Association contended that, if cases of discrimination in the schools have oc-

curred, they are rare and of recent origin, and that "there is no such thing as a policy of discrimination on the ground of race, color, or creed."

In an Open Letter, published in *The New York Times*, that veteran fighter, Dr. Stephen S. Wise, president of the American Jewish Congress, attacked the statement, declaring that "it must cause anyone remotely acquainted with the facts to wonder whether our educators have yet learned to read." Dr. Wise discloses why the Association indulges in such a hypocritical statement in order to block the establishment of a quota-free State University, or any legislation effectively eliminating the quota system, namely—because private donations to higher educational institutions might be severely curtailed: "There is the real nub of the matter," writes Dr. Wise: "The biases of wealthy benefactors must be safeguarded even at the cost of denying freedom of educational opportunity to so many of the people of this state."

△ △ △

ABOUT THE SAME TIME when Dr. Wise published his angry letter in *The New York Times*, another Jewish leader, Dr. Chaim Weizmann addressed a huge crowd at the 16th annual *New York Herald Tribune* Forum at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. He spoke about "Judaism's Spiritual Contribution to the Strength of Man," and this reviewer cannot resist the temptation of quoting a few sentences from that great old man's address:

Monotheism, the supreme importance of perfectibility in this sad, sublunar world, the refusal to be bullied by superior force, the right to persist as a minority—these are the leading elements in the Jewish contribution to human progress. . . . Fundamentally, the Jewish people has fulfilled this function: the assertion of the sovereignty of the human spirit over the brutality of circumstances.

△ △ △

AT ANOTHER LARGE HALL, tribute was paid to a Jewish-born composer who died

one hundred years ago: Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy. The Philharmonic Symphony under Mr. Stokowski's direction observed the anniversary by the performance of the "Scotch" symphony. On this occasion the distinguished music critic, Olin Downes, wrote a remarkable article in *The New York Times*, remarkable insofar as it linked Felix' genius with his Jewish background, regardless of the fact that Felix had been baptized as a boy:

The thing that made Felix Mendelssohn so great and that has kept his music alive was his culture, and the moral and intellectual background which brought his gifts into being. This resulted not from his father's wealth, or connections, but from an earlier forebear, and all that was accomplished by that individual for his people. We are speaking of the little hunch-backed Jewish school teacher and philosopher, Felix' grandfather, Moses, son of Mendel, who was the original of Lessing's *Nathan the Wise*.

Mr. Downes ends wittily by remarking: "The spirit of old Moses must have smiled when his grandson remarked, with a laugh, that he, a Jew, in reviving Bach's St. Matthew Passion, had thus restored this great work of faith to Christianity."

△ △ △

TURNING FROM THE DEAD to the living geniuses, we find in New York Mr. Ari Ibn-Zahav, Palestinian author of eighteen books, who travelled from the Holy Land to the less holy Western Hemisphere in order to help stage a Yiddish version of his play, *Shylock and his Daughter*. Like every Jew he was deeply distressed, after reading *The Merchant of Venice*, that even great Shakespeare could not entirely rid himself of the prejudices of his era: "It is not that there was no such Jew as Shylock," he declared in an interview: "There COULD not be, any more than the Empire State Building could be supported by paper. You cannot find him in 5,000 years of history."

Re-interpreting the old drama, he wrote *Shylock and his Daughter*, which is now being offered at New York's Yiddish Art Theater, with Maurice Schwartz

playing the role of the unhappy old Jew. In this new version the plot has been changed thoroughly. For instance, Antonio borrows the 3,000 ducats not in order to help Bassanio in the wooing of Portia, but to aid Lorenzo in the stealing of Shylock's daughter from her father. Jessica marries Lorenzo, but only after a great struggle in her soul. Shylock is portrayed, not as a greedy old man, but as a tragic victim of the circumstances of his time, as a pious Jew loathing the pound-of-flesh transaction.

This is not the first time that Mr. Schwartz has offered a serious play of high literary value to his audience. Last year, for instance, he introduced here Zalman Shneur, with the stage adaptation of the novel, *Song of the Dnieper*.

△ △ △

YOU ALL KNOW MEYER LEVIN, the Chicagoan, who, ten years ago, became famous by his novel *The Old Bunch*, that story of a group of young Chicagoans and their different attempts to deal with the depression. Well, despite his fame he hasn't forgotten that he's a Jew, a member of a persecuted race. Returning from a trip to Palestine, he wrote a moving novel, *My Father's House*, that was published by The Viking Press. Since more people go to the movies than read first-class books, Herbert Kline hit the spot when he produced, in collaboration with the Chicago author, a movie, based on the book. Shown at the Ambassador Theater, the movie gives you the story of a boy, David Halevy who, looking for his family from which he was separated in Poland during the German occupation, finally lands in Palestine, where he goes to agricultural settlements, to the Dead Sea Potash factory, to Jerusalem, to Tel Aviv, and so forth.

This is not a great picture, but it is a moving one, as moving as is the sincerity of the actors, all amateurs, who play, not artificial roles, but—themselves, with

their sorrows and hopes. Incidentally, those who neither read novels nor go to movie theaters have a chance of familiarizing themselves with the story, too. For The Viking Press has made another version of the book—*ad usum Delphini*, so to speak—namely, a picture-story book, entitled, *If I Forget Thee*, containing 200 striking photographs and a very short accompanying narrative.

△ △ △

BEN SHAHN's one-man show at the Museum of Modern Art is the talk of the town. Born in Kaunas, Russia, in 1898, Ben arrived in the United States at the age of eight. He studied first at the National Academy of Design, then traveled in Europe where he was strongly influenced by French masters, especially by Rouault. No less an artist than Diego Rivera hired Shahn as his assistant on the Rockefeller Center frescoes. But Ben did not always satisfy his employers, especially those politically reactionary or artistically too conservative to grasp the gropings of his soul. With Lou Block commissioned by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration to prepare murals for a main prison corridor at Riker's Island penitentiary, he had his completed sketches rejected by the Municipal Art Commission as "artistically and in other respects" unsatisfactory. Similarly, his sketches for a projected series of murals on the Four Freedoms to be painted in the post office at St. Louis, Mo., were rejected on political grounds.

Ben Shahn is a revolutionary, a satirist like Daumier in the nineteenth century, or George Grosz in our own. His gouache paintings on the trial of Sacco and Vanzetti are unforgettable. Looking at the series one understands the artist's painful outcry: "Ever since I could remember I'd wished that I'd been lucky enough to be alive at a great time—when something big was going on, like the Crucifixion. And suddenly I realized I was.

Here I was living through another crucifixion. Here was something to paint."

Ben Shahn's powerful works include paintings on the Dreyfus Case and the Mooney Case, and remarkable illustrations for the Haggadah. The posters he created for the C. I. O. Political Action Committee are striking examples of an art that does not lose its value by being used for propaganda purposes.

△ △ △

AN OUTSTANDING Jewish merchant, cultural leader, and philanthropist, Salmann Schocken, has recently celebrated his seventieth birthday in far-away Jerusalem. His publishing house there is flourishing, and Schocken's private library of some 50,000 volumes, including many rare manuscripts and ancient prints has become a center of literary and cultural activities.

In New York City his son, Theodore Schocken, threw a party to indicate the launching of a series of inexpensive but nevertheless handsomely printed and bound volumes of Jewish interest which are being issued by the New York branch of the firm. The party at which *kol Yisroel* were present (or so it seemed) was a great success. Everyone admired the new series of the "Schocken Library," displayed on shelves and tables. So far they include *The Language of Prayer* (a selection from the most expressive Jewish prayers, in Hebrew and in English translations); Yitzhak F. Baer's historical essay, *Gaut*, examining Jewish history since the dispersion of the Jews from Palestine; *From the Land of Sheba*, a collection of the folk-lore, legends, and songs of the Jews of Yemen; Heine's *Rabbi of Bacherach*, and Solomon Maimon's *Autobiography*, relating the story of that 18th century rebel intellectual.

In 1503 Ivan the Terrible conquered Polotzk, and for the first time the Russian Government was confronted by the fact of the existence of the Jewish nationality. The Czar's advisers were somewhat perplexed, and asked him what to do with these newly acquired subjects. Ivan the Terrible answered unhesitatingly: 'Baptize them or drown them in the river.' They were drowned.

P. MILYUKOV, 1916

WASHINGTON NOTES

By MURRAY FRANK

HIGH TRIBUTE to immigrants of all national origins and to their descendants was paid recently by President Truman on the occasion of the dedication of a memorial foundation in Washington to the late Oscar S. Straus, who came to this country as an immigrant boy from Bavaria and rose high in the ranks of American public life. Alluding to the Straus family as "displaced persons" of another era because of their participation in democratic activities in a monarchical Europe, President Truman pointed to their belief in the freedom of the individual which eventually drove them out of Europe. When they failed to gain this freedom, "they, with a great number of people of like mind, came to this country and made a contribution for which we can never be grateful enough."

The President went a step further. Referring directly to the prejudice, intolerance, and mistrust of minority groups and immigrants of our own day, the Chief Executive emphasized the fact that if we had had the same situation in 1852 as we have now this country would have lost the services of the Straus family and many others who have contributed immeasurably to American democracy. He, therefore, very aptly termed the fountain as being more than a mere memorial to a great statesman, diplomat and patriot, it is also "a monument to tolerance and reason."

Oscar Straus served as U. S. Ambassador to Turkey during the administrations of Presidents Cleveland, McKinley, and later Taft. During the years 1906-1909, he was Secretary of Commerce and Labor

under President Theodore Roosevelt, thus being the first American Jew to be honored with a Cabinet position. He was also for many years the American member at the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague. Straus was the author of several outstanding books dealing with religious liberty in the United States, among them *The Development of Religious Liberty in the United States* and *Origin of The Republican Form of Government*, both of monumental and scholarly caliber, also an excellent biography of Roger Williams and other works. He died May 3, 1926.

Although the memorial was authorized by a joint resolution of Congress in 1929, it was for reasons unknown not completed until now. Notwithstanding the long delay, however, no more auspicious time for its dedication could be found. Of striking importance is the fact that President Truman, aside from his tribute to immigrants, capitalized on the occasion to renew his fervent plea for the admission of Europe's displaced persons to the United States and to express his indignation against the existence of immigration barriers against the DPs.

The memorial also served as the occasion for a renewal of emphasis on the true meaning of American democracy, the contributions made to it by successive generations of immigrants of all classes and nationalities, and the need for greater understanding and cooperation among the various groups comprising this nation. Typical was the editorial remark in *The Washington Star*, which said:

"But Mr. Straus would have wanted

appreciation for only one aspect of his efforts. He understood the need for men who can be living ties between divergent groups in the Nation. . . . His monument will testify to his vision of America as a melting pot in the best sense of the phrase—a place where people of all classes and schools of thought co-operate for mutual advantage. He proved the practicability of such striving. . . .”



THIS BRINGS US to the question of immigration due to come up in Congress at the January session. It is not expected that the brief special session now under way, which was called to deal specifically with the problems of European aid and the threat of inflation in this country, will find the time to delve into the question of immigration and the related DP problems. This is one of the “unfinished” items left over from the last session which failed to take action on the Stratton bill to admit 400,000 DPs of all nationalities into the U. S. The failure of Congress to deal with this question doomed the hundreds of thousands of the worst victims of Nazism to another winter of misery in the DP camps in Germany and Austria, their third winter since “liberation!”

What is the outlook in the next session of Congress? At this time, it still looks none too favorable. Renewed efforts will unquestionably be made in the House of Representatives for passage of the Stratton bill. Many of our Congressmen have visited Europe during the summer and fall, they studied conditions in the DP camps and have come away with a more favorable impression of the camp inmates and the need for specific action on the part of the U. S. But it will be most difficult to translate these impressions into deeds.

The great stumbling-block now lies in the Senate. Prior to adjournment of its regular session last July, the Senate approved a resolution to undertake an in-

vestigation of the whole immigration system, including the DP problem, which is to be completed and presented to the Senate by March 1, 1948. That, in itself, is an indication that the Senate will take no action until the report of the investigation is completed, and presumably the House will await the results of the investigation.

The resolution to conduct an investigation of the immigration system was introduced by Senator Chapman Revercomb, West Virginia Republican and a known foe of liberalizing immigration laws. He posed four questions at the time: 1—whether our present immigration quotas are proper; 2—whether the capacity of this country warrants the further absorption of immigrants; 3—whether our present method of determining eligibility to admittance is a sound one; 4—whether we should adopt the Canadian system of selectivity of immigrants.

From early indications, it is clear that the purpose of the investigation is not to increase quotas or remove immigration barriers. On the contrary, it is believed here that the investigation will suggest further reduction of the quotas or possibly the establishment of selective immigration on the Canadian order, which by its very nature is discriminatory against certain religious and nationality groups. Minority group leaders see a two-fold purpose as the real objective behind the Revercomb resolution: 1) to delay a solution of the DP problem as long as possible in the hope that the DPs will in the meantime be able to emigrate to other countries; 2) to build up a new case for the revision of the present quota system either by reducing it or by substituting selective immigration based on discrimination as to national origin, religious affiliation, selected occupations, etc.



BY THE TIME these lines appear in print, the special session of Congress now going

on will be drawing to a close, most probably between the middle of December and Christmas. Preparations will be in full swing for the regular session scheduled to begin on January 3, the President's "State of the Union" message dealing with his legislative proposals will already be taking shape, and so will also the Republican program which is expected to center around tax reduction, reduction of governmental expenditures, and public and social welfare. In fact, it was the original intention of the Republican leaders in Congress to devote the 1948 session of our highest legislative body chiefly to social problems, such as the DP question, housing, Federal aid to education, the high cost of living, the establishment of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Committee to deal with discrimination in employment, the anti-poll tax bill, the anti-lynching bill, etc.

How much of this program can be realized remains to be seen. Despite the critical situation in international affairs which brought about cooperation in our foreign policy, there is little cooperation between the administration and Congress and between the opposing political parties in Congress where it concerns domestic issues. The 1948 session will be completely overshadowed by the presidential elections less than a year from now and it is, therefore, inevitable that every action taken by Congress will be taken with an eye on the political situation in the country and its effect on the 1948 elections. Experienced observers in the Nation's Capital look for the next session to be one of those knock-down, drag-out affairs where little is accomplished. Under the circumstances, it will be a miracle if in addition to problems of an international scope half of the so-called social program planned originally by the Republicans will be acted upon by Congress.



AFTER NEARLY a year's work, President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights has

virtually completed its report which was described by one of its members as "a cubic foot of dynamite." On the basis of this report, the President is expected to ask Congress for sweeping changes in the laws guaranteeing the civil rights of citizens which have been in existence since the end of the Civil War.

The Civil Rights Committee is comprised of 15 distinguished citizens of all faiths and minority groups who were appointed by President Truman a year ago in December to make a thorough study of civil rights and to suggest legislation to protect these rights. At the time of their appointment, the members of the committee were warned by the Chief Executive that this country had gone through periods "when organized groups fanned hatred and intolerance until, at times, mob action struck fear into the hearts of men and women because of their racial origin and religious beliefs."

The committee has spent the entire year 1947 in studying the problem, particularly the inadequacy of the Federal civil rights statutes, it held long hearings, it consulted with responsible leaders of various minority groups such as Negroes, Jews, Japanese-Americans, citizens of Mexican origin, also Catholic leaders and others. The following are some of the suggestions recommended by the committee in their report to the President:

Reorganization of the Department of Justice to include an additional Assistant Attorney General to deal specifically with the problem of civil rights.

An adequate staff which is to devote full time to the problem, to assist in the prosecution of violators and to be on guard for the protection of these rights for the citizenry of the country.

The Justice Department should be granted greater power to intervene more frequently as a "friend of the court" in civil rights cases, even where local, state, and city authorities have jurisdiction.

A law establishing a term of 20 years prison and a payment of a fine of \$10,000

for those found guilty of participation in a lynching, including local public officials.

In addition to these, there will also be another half dozen or more recommendations to abolish the poll-tax, prohibit discrimination in employment, in education, in public services, etc. All freedom-loving people of this country, and not least among them the minority groups, look to Congress to give these recommendations serious and thoughtful consideration and eventual enactment of those suggestions which will defend the civil rights of all citizens and strengthen American democracy.



A MUCH-DISCUSSED problem which has been assuming unusually large dimensions and has resulted in a very great deal of tension involving minority groups is now headed for the Supreme Court, where it is due to come up early in December. We refer here to the so-called Covenants Issue, also known as Restrictive Covenants, which is the fancy name for that ugly and malignant form of discrimination which restricts Negroes, Jews, Italians, Persians, Syrians, Catholics, etc., from moving into certain "white Gentile," "zoned" or "restricted" areas. So urgent has this problem become that the Supreme Court has agreed to review a series of cases where the legality of these restrictive property covenants is being challenged. Hearings are scheduled to begin in the Supreme Court on December 8, involving specific cases from Washington, D. C., St. Louis, Los Angeles, and Columbus, Ohio.

While these are selected cases, many incidents involving restrictive property covenants are known to have occurred in various parts of the country. Until now, the lower courts have tended to regard these secret covenants as private matters in which the state had no right to interfere. Those who seek invalidation of

these covenants claim that their enforcement violates the Bill of Rights, particularly Amendment Five to the Constitution which guarantees that no person shall "be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law," and also the so-called Civil Acts Right which declares that all citizens have the same right "as is enjoyed by white citizens to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold, and convey real and personal property." It will undoubtedly also be argued that property restrictions are a violation of the United Nations Charter which was signed by the United States and which calls for "universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without discrimination as to race, sex, language, or religion."

It is to be hoped that the members of the Supreme Court will see this problem in its wider context, namely, that these discriminatory agreements limiting the living space for members of racial, religious and national minorities constitute in reality one of the greatest dangers to democracy, that they advocate ipso facto the establishment of a Ghetto system in the United States, and that they smack too much of the Nazi Nuremberg laws. Such covenants should be declared unenforceable by the Supreme Court. Throughout the length and breadth of this country—throughout the whole world, in fact—people of all national and racial origins will be watching for the decision of the Supreme Court.

In discussing the problem of restrictive covenants, former Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes had this to say recently:

"Tension between minority groups and the majority of the Nation's population has been growing for some time. The situation gives cause for the alarm and apprehension of every American who loves liberty. If this contagion of hate and prejudice is to be eradicated, stern measures are necessary. Unless all of us, of whatever religion or race, strive together to cut out this social cancer, it will once

again, as it did in 1939, destroy both the essential rights of man and the peace of the world."



IN CONCLUSION, we should like to devote the remaining space to a few remarks on Palestine. In the past, whenever we touched upon this question, it was always in a forlorn and pessimistic manner. Since the last issue of our "Notes," the matter has taken a decided turn for the better, so much so that a solution of this long and vexing problem is now in the realm of possibility. Both the U. S. and Russia, the two pivotal states in the United Nations, have come out in support of the UN Special Committee's majority report which advocates partition of the Holy Land and the establishment of separate and independent Jewish and Arab states.

Adoption of the majority proposals requires a two-thirds vote in the UN General Assembly, or at least 38 of the 57 nations of the UN. As these lines are written, the showdown has not yet taken place and not until official and final approval of the majority plan is voted by the UN can a solution be regarded as certain. Nevertheless, one cannot lose faith in humanity and in the belief that justice will prevail and the nations of the world will not be blinded by base politics, the stench of oil, and the hollow threats of the Arab feudal clique. Common decency dictates that the Jewish people be given the opportunity to rebuild Palestine for the European Jewish survivors and other Jews who wish to settle there.

By its decision to support the cause of a Jewish state in Palestine, the U. S. has taken a notable stand which should long be remembered by the Jewish people as of great historic significance. Once its position had been announced, this country sought to ascertain several things in the first few weeks, such as the general reaction to its views, the seriousness of the Arab threats, future Arab plans, etc.

Of particular interest is the fact that after Russia expressed its support of the majority plan, opposition in American military circles to the establishment of a Jewish state had ceased almost over night since now the Arab bluff of "turning toward Russia" had exploded practically in their face. On the other hand State Department Officials, long known for their violent anti-Zionist views, have remained adamant and in some instances are reported to be encouraging the Arabs to continued opposition and refusal to compromise.

American military leaders and State Department officials, nevertheless, agree that above all there must be no unrest in the Middle East. Unrest at this time would undermine the political and economic stability of the whole area, it would endanger American interests there, as well as the interests and the very existence of the Middle East countries themselves. These views were presumably conveyed to the Arab delegations at the UN and to their home governments lest they make any unwarranted moves which might lead to general unrest. In the case of Saudi Arabia and Lebanon, it is believed that they were warned that an attack on Palestine would result in a delay of shipment of steel from the U. S. for the construction of the new oil pipeline from Saudi Arabian oil-fields to its terminus point in Lebanon. For those two countries, who are so vitally dependent on the oil royalties from the U. S., it would simply mean hitting them over the pocketbook.



SEVERAL DAYS AGO, this correspondent had the extreme pleasure of hearing during the course of the same evening two internationally-known figures, one representing a great and strong nation and the other a small and weak nation, who by the very nature of their approach to the Palestine problem and by their understanding of the tragic plight of the Jewish

people have succeeded in rekindling faith in humanity in the hearts of many people. The occasion was at a dinner of the Brandeis Zionist District of Washington, which was attended by nearly a thousand guests. The two speakers were: the representative of the great and strong nation—Bartley C. Crum, American, a member of last year's Anglo-American Inquiry Committee on Palestine and author of the book "Behind the Silken Curtain;" the representative of the small and weak nation—Dr. Jorge Garcia Granados, Ambassador of Guatemala to the U. S., Guatemalan representative to the UN and a staunch supporter of the UN majority plan which he helped draw up as a member of the UN Special Committee on Palestine.

Dr. Granados, who spoke first, stated that the Jewish case was infinitely stronger than the Arab case because for the Jewish people Palestine is a question of hope and a reason for living as human beings, and not a question of gaining additional territory. He expressed amazement at the accomplishments of Jews in Palestine in the political, economic, social, cultural, and other aspects of human endeavor, in the face of adverse political circumstances and in a challenging physical environment. In view of such accomplishments, Dr. Granados believes it im-

possible that the world should deny to Jews their right to Palestine.

Crum made a forceful appeal for immediate implementation of the UN committee's recommendation to transfer 150,000 homeless European Jews to Palestine, but instead of dragging the process out over a period of two years as advocated in the majority report, he suggested that the Jewish DPs could be taken out of the DP camps and brought to Palestine within 30 days. He also expressed certainty that the Jewish defense group Haganah could maintain law and order in the country when the British leave and he, therefore, called for legislation and international recognition of Haganah as the official security force of Palestine. As for the rulers of the Arab countries, he maintained that they can be bought for a price by anyone; therefore they are not the kind of dependable allies the U. S. wants in the Middle East.

This is the essence of the views expressed by the two men who have contributed so much in the shaping of favorable conclusions on the Jewish case for Palestine in their respective committees. The future Jewish state, when and if it comes into being, will owe these two men a debt of gratitude. For this correspondent it was truly a most delightful and memorable evening.

The Jew will always be in danger of finding himself the scapegoat of national and social hysteria, but sanity will yet return to the world, and moral principles are eternal; and, in any civilization which is founded on moral concepts, anti-Semitism is a measure not of Jewish failings, but of Gentile failure.

JAMES PARKES, 1939

West Coast Letter

By CAREY McWILLIAMS

THE NEWS OF THE QUARTER, on the west coast, has been the long-anticipated investigation of "Communism in Hollywood" by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Some such investigation has been brewing now for six or eight years. Based on earlier hearings in Los Angeles, which served as a rehearsal for the big show in Washington, J. Parnell Thomas and his dreary colleagues have done their mightiest to make a mountain out of a molehill and, in retrospect, it will be generally agreed that they look very silly indeed. While the hearings have fizzled out, it would be a mistake to overlook a number of sinister aspects which have enshrouded the investigation since it was first proposed.

What the American public does not realize—because it has not been informed of the fact,—is that all of the "anti" wit-

nesses, whose testimony was given such sensational prominence, are members of an organization which should have been the subject of the investigation, namely, the Motion Picture Alliance for the Preservation of American Ideals. Sam Wood, Menjou, Robert Taylor, Rupert Hughes, James K. McGuinness, and the rest of the cast recruited by Thomas, are all active members and leaders of this curious organization. Just was is, then, the Motion Picture Alliance? Or, stated another way, with whom is the Alliance allied?

The Alliance was formed in February, 1944, for the purpose, as Sam Wood put it, of countering the impression that Hollywood was "a hotbed of sedition and subversion." From other evidence, however, it is apparent that this was not the real purpose for which the Alliance was formed. In an editorial of February 8, 1944, the Los Angeles *Examiner* gave a somewhat different explanation. Without mincing words, this editorial charged (a) that a subversive minority had contrived to make "a long succession of insidious and evil motion pictures;" (b) in the making of these films, the same minority had disparaged American history and traditions; and (c) that for this "deplorable state of affairs the managers and producers" were themselves largely to blame. Here was clearly foreshadowed, as the hearings in Washington

THE CHICAGO JEWISH FORUM is happy to announce that with this issue it is commencing the regular publication of a *West Coast Letter* by the distinguished California writer and citizen, CAREY McWILLIAMS. He has written *Ill Fares the Land*, *Brothers Under the Skin*, *Prejudice*, *Southern California Country*, *Ambrose Bierce*, *Louis Adamic and Shadow America*. *Yellow Myth*, a new book of his on anti-Semitism will be published early in 1948. Mr. McWilliams is a contributing editor of the "Nation." He has received several awards for his work in the field of race relations.

have now revealed, a campaign to undermine the freedom of the screen. From the very beginning, therefore, it is apparent that the Alliance has aimed at imposing a form of censorship on the industry. Along with Thomas, Rankin, and Hearst, the leaders of the Alliance have wanted to coerce the producers in a twofold manner: first, to force them not to make any more pictures like *North Star* and *Casablanca*; and, second, to make a series of so-called "anti-communist" pictures.

From the outset, this thinly concealed plot has involved an element of indirect blackmail. Since the leaders of the Alliance are all employed in the motion picture industry,—as writers, directors, producers, and actors,—it would never do, of course, for them to attack directly their employers, namely, the major studios. But such an attack has been absolutely essential to the campaign for censorship; for if the films have contained "propaganda," communist or otherwise, the producers themselves are solely responsible. Unwilling to attack the producers, the leaders of the Alliance have conspired to provide Thomas and Rankin with an excuse for such an attack by raising a great hue-and-cry about "Communists in Hollywood." Once this cry was raised, the House Committee would have an ostensible reason for investigating the industry and the secret aim of this investigation at all times has been, not to expose communism, but to impose a censorship on the industry. The plot failed, momentarily at least, for the simple reason that the committee failed to prove,—in fact it cannot be proven,—that Hollywood films contain communist propaganda. In the Los Angeles hearings, the committee tried hard to discover such films or to get the spokesmen for the Alliance to point out objectionable scenes, etc. This the Alliance was reluctant to do for the reason already noted, namely, that this would have placed the Alliance in its true light and revealed its interest in censorship. However at a public meet-

ing sponsored by the Alliance in Los Angeles, its executive director read a list of films which he said had been reported by the House Committee on un-American Activities to contain "communist" propaganda. And here is the list: "The Best Years of Our Lives," "Margie," "The Strange Love of Martha Ivers," "A Medal for Benny," "The Searching Wind," "Watch on the Rhine," "North Star," "Casablanca," "Mission to Moscow," and "Pride of the Marines!" Only those who have seen these films can thoroughly appreciate the absurdity of the charge that they contain "communist" propaganda. What some of these films do contain, however, is a strong emphasis on democratic values, an emphasis which is, of course, intolerable to a Thomas or a Rankin.

There is still another aspect of the recently concluded hearings that should be emphasized. Between the date of the rehearsal hearings in Los Angeles and the current Washington circus, J. Parnell Thomas apparently became very much interested in a particular motion picture—*Crossfire*. For it will be noted that at the Washington hearings nearly every person who had anything to do with the making of this picture was subpoenaed. One of the men cited for contempt is the director of the film; another cited for contempt is the man who produced *Crossfire*; and, among those grilled at the hearings, was Dore Schary, the courageous and liberal-minded director of productions at the studio where the film was made. In fact, had it not been for Mr. Schary there is reason to believe that the industry would have declined to make this fine film. By no stretch of even the most morbid imagination can it be said that there is any "communist" propaganda in *Crossfire*, unless, of course, exposing anti-semitism is to be regarded as exclusively a Communist activity. The interest that the committee has shown in *Crossfire* needs to be studied in the light of a speech which Rankin made in the

house in 1945. In this speech, the Mississippi bigot ranted and raved about "alien-minded communistic enemies of Christianity" in Hollywood. He also let the cat out of the bag by boasting that the "old-time American producers, actors, and writers" in Hollywood—that is, the leaders of the Alliance,—were behind the investigation and were supplying the committee with "evidence." Thus it is clear that the Alliance has long been allied with Messrs. Thomas, Rankin, and Hearst, in a far-reaching plot to impose censorship on the industry. While it cannot be proved that the Alliance is anti-Semitic, it can be proved that it has not hesitated to cooperate with such anti-semites as Rankin. And this circumstance takes on a special interest when one scrutinizes the list of officers and directors of the Alliance for, with the exception of one name, the list is wholly non-Jewish.

Some additional light may be thrown on the Alliance by the circumstance that it selected as its executive director one John Lechner. For several decades, now, "Dr." Lechner has been an active race-baiter in Los Angeles with a long record of racist activities. He is the author of a recklessly defamatory pamphlet entitled *Playing With Dynamite* which was used as part of the campaign to exclude 125,000 Japanese, two-thirds of whom were citizens of the United States, from the west coast during the war. I had occasion in my book *Prejudice* to devote several pages to the activities of Dr. Lechner. Long posing as a spokesman for the American Legion, Lechner was explicitly repudiated by the Legion in an official statement published in the *California Legionnaire* of January 15, 1944. That the Alliance should have chosen Lechner as its director is a detail important to a true understanding of the organization and its purposes. In a mass meeting held in Hollywood on June 26, 1944, which was attended by over a thousand delegates from the Hollywood guilds and trade-unions, the Alliance was denounced as

"a violently partisan group under the leadership of notorious union-wreckers." This, then, is the character of the organization whose spokesmen have arrogated to themselves the right to question the "loyalty" of other American citizens. Throughout the Washington hearings, Chairman Thomas was very careful not to reveal the fact that his pet witnesses were all members of the Alliance; nor did the name of the Alliance get into the headlines which so promiscuously smeared some of the finest individuals in the industry.

While the Thomas committee has been forced to beat a hasty retreat, it is by no means clear that the threat of censorship has been eliminated. The Thomases and the Rankins would like nothing better than to be able to coerce the industry into making the kind of pictures they would like to see made. If the motion picture industry could be "coordinated" with their reactionary schemes, the publishing industry would be next on the list; then the schools; and, ultimately, radio, press, and pulpit. Fortunately the progressive elements in Hollywood determined to fight the committee, not obliquely but directly, by an open challenge to its authority. And, as the hearings developed, the industry leaders saw the peril of censorship and began to square-off against the committee also. Momentarily defeated, the committee will return to the attack, perhaps with re-enforcements. Only the complete abolition of this rump inquisition can safeguard the freedom of the American screen. The motion picture industry obviously makes many bad pictures, stupid pictures, corny pictures; but, in this instance, stupidities are preferable to propaganda films dictated by, and approved by, the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

* * * *

OF ALL MINORITY GROUPS in Southern California, Mexicans are the most important numerically. In Los Angeles

County alone, there are upwards of 385,000, the largest urban Mexican center in the world outside of Mexico City. Judged by any objective standard,—type of housing, income, occupation, etc.—Mexicans are also the most disadvantaged minority in the region. In Los Angeles proper, the Mexican community lacks the cohesion, the organization, the leadership of the large Negro community. But, of late years, there have been numerous signs indicating that the Mexicans are reaching a new social and political maturity. Four Mexican-American residents of the little settlement of El Modeno took the initiative in bringing action against the school authorities of Orange County to test the constitutionality of segregated schools. Won in the lower court, the decision of Judge Paul J. McCormick was recently affirmed by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and is now on its way to the United States Supreme Court. Known as the "Westminster Case," this action is likely to make legal history. When the case reached the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, important assistance was given the plaintiffs by the American Jewish Congress, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the American Civil Liberties Union, the National Lawyers Guild, and the Japanese-American Citizens League. The brief which the American Jewish Congress filed in this case is one of the finest documents of its kind that I have ever read. It was prepared by the late A. H. Pekelis who had a wonderful faculty for developing issues of this kind. The way in which the various interested groups cooperated in the handling of this case might serve as an object-lesson for the future.

Chicagoans will be interested, also, to learn that a Chicago organization has taken a most active interest in Mexican-

Americans. Recently the Industrial Areas Foundation (the "Back-of-the-Yards" movement) employed Fred W. Ross, formerly with the American Council on Race Relations, to undertake some important work among Mexicans in the "east side" communities of Los Angeles. A very talented and effective organizer, Mr. Ross has demonstrated, in his work with the American Council on Race Relations, that Mexican-Americans quickly respond, given a little leadership, direction, and guidance. If the Industrial Areas Foundation can keep Mr. Ross in the field for a year or so, some interesting results will certainly be obtained. I report this development with some embarrassment, for interested Los Angeles groups should have done, twenty years ago, what a Chicago organization is now doing for them.

* * * *

BECAUSE READERS of the FORUM may otherwise miss seeing it, I want to call their attention to a most important book in the field of race relations. Published by Henry Holt and Company, it is *Community of the Free* by Yves R. Simon, who teaches philosophy in a French university. The book is made up of four essays only one of which, entitled "Secret Sources of the Success of the Racist Ideology," deals with race relations. This essay appeared, some years ago, in *The Review of Politics*. While there are some points made in the essay with which I find myself in disagreement, still, all in all, this is perhaps the most penetrating, revealing expose of the secret sources of the racist ideology that has yet appeared in print. Frankly I wouldn't trade this compact essay for the two volumes by Gunnar Myrdal. It is absolutely "must" reading for any one interested in what we still call "the race problem."



Liberation Cypress

LEON GORDON MILLER

BOOKS

Kingsblood Royal, by Sinclair Lewis. Random House. New York. 1947. 348 pp. \$3.00.

Sinclair Lewis, by reason of his prominence in the literary world, is an interesting phenomenon. Upton Sinclair, only, can rival him in his particular vein, the dramatization of social issues. But whereas, if he chooses, Mr. Sinclair can create characters which have some breath of life in them, Mr. Lewis either cannot or chooses not to do so. His books have the quality of a morality play such as *Everyman*, or of an allegory such as *Pilgrim's Progress*. The characters are but names for points of view. Mr. Worldly Wiseman and Mr. Facing Bothways speak appropriately to us, though their words have not to do with religious issues but with the controverted social issues of today. Mr. Lewis is an excellent journalist with a nose for news. He anticipates rival novelists and pamphleteers by giving his public a dramatization of the thoughts which today are but half formulated in their minds or which they are about to hold tomorrow though they do not know it.

In doing this, by shaping the formless and chaotic thought of the average reader, Mr. Lewis, I believe, does a great deal to mold the beliefs of many thousands of Americans, not those of the educated and well-read classes, who will have long since passed Mr. Lewis in his social thinking, but the vastly greater number who plod more slowly the road of enlightenment. For these Mr. Lewis may be, and doubtless is, a minor prophet. Happily he is on the side of the angels, detesting tyranny and intolerance, a believer in the brotherhood of man and the equality of all peoples, white, black, and yellow.

The theme of his latest book is racial intolerance in the United States, our cruel and unjust treatment of the Negro. The parable is sufficiently improbable. A

young American business man, conventional, successful, and common-place discovers that he is 1-32 part negro. One of his great great-grandfathers, a negro pioneer and admirable person, like all the negroes in the story, had married an Indian squaw. The young business man, much perturbed, seeks the company of negroes, learns the abuse and injustice which they suffer, finds them almost without exception superior to the white people he knows, and on the strength of his one-thirty-second drop of negro blood, declares himself a negro.

Thereupon he suffers all the persecutions of the Christian martyrs and the vicissitudes of Job. None—or it may be one or two, quite ineffectually—of his white friends stand by him. His wife vacillates like a windmill, exhibiting every attitude a wife in such circumstances could take, and ends by standing beside him when, in the concluding chapter, he holds off the local mob bent on destroying his home in the select residential neighborhood. She is, possibly, the most unconvincing character in the book.

So much for the story, which has no interest whatsoever as such, that is as a convincing picture of how characters so circumstanced would plausibly act. But the book, through the mouths of its characters, each with his particular slant of bigotry and prejudice, does give every possible anti-negro argument, every racial superstition, lie, and scientific fallacy that has been uttered in Congress by senators from Mississippi, by members of the Klan, or by native fascists who would foment a race war for their own evil ends. Mr. Lewis must have a compendious scrapbook, for everything that his characters say, incredible as it may seem, has somehow an authentic ring. To read these obscene remarks and arguments serves, or should serve, to convert every

reader with any sense of decency fair-mindedness, and love of justice to enlist under the banner of righteousness.

Mr. Lewis in this formidable citation of the evidence, the things that Americans have said and do say about the negro, has by summing up and airing our greatest shame as a nation done something, it may be much, to end it.

CARL GRABO

Thaddeus Kosciuszko, Leader and Exile, by Miecislau Haiman. Polish Institute of Arts & Sciences in America. New York. 183 p. \$3.00.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko, patriot-hero of Poland and of the American Revolution, received his early education in French military schools where he also appears to have imbibed many of the democratic ideas that were to exert a profound influence upon his later years. Following his disappointment over the First Partition of Poland in 1772 and unable to afford the price of a commission in the shrunken Polish army, he left for America to aid the Colonies in their struggle for independence. Arriving here in 1776, he joined the Continentals as engineer with colonel's rank and soon earned distinction by his bravery and knowledge of the military arts. It was Kosciuszko who inspired the founding of the military academy at West Point and whose military manuals were among the first to be published in this country. In 1782 he received the rank of brigadier-general and two years later returned to Poland to take part in a series of ill-fated campaigns against her destroyers.

In this second and concluding volume of his biographical study of Kosciuszko, Mr. Haiman covers the period following Kosciuszko's return to Europe in 1784 to his death as voluntary exile in Switzerland in 1817. The portrait drawn for the reader is that of a middle-aged, life-saddened man wanting intimate attachments of wife and family, harassed incessantly by financial troubles (his picayune Polish estate failing to yield more than bare subsistence), whose sufferings were further aggravated by the tragic fate overtaking his native land where matters drifted inexorably from bad to worse.

In this sombre period Kosciuszko clung tenaciously to his dream of a reintegrated Poland based on an enlightened peasantry

freed of its feudal bondage, ideas that were hardly calculated to enlist the support of the land magnates comprising Poland's powerful aristocracy. Such ideas, however, demonstrated the inherent potency of the democratic faith linking the hopes of Europe's oppressed to the achievements of the colonies in the New World in their recent struggle for liberation.

After the Polish-Russian war of 1792, Kosciuszko repaired to France where he sought abortively to obtain the aid of the French Committee of Public Safety in Poland's cause. Kosciuszko frequently thought of himself in those days as a Polish George Washington destined to lead his ragged peasant battalions through overwhelming odds to final triumph.

After two years spent as a Russian prisoner of war, Kosciuszko left St. Petersburg in 1796, together with his friend, the poet Julian Niemcewicz, for England and the United States. He was warmly welcomed upon his arrival in Philadelphia although the city was then undergoing the ravages of yellow fever. While he saw many of his old army friends, Kosciuszko spent much of his time convalescing from old battle wounds and sketching in water colors and India ink. His friends meanwhile pressed Congress for action on the arrears of his army pay of which he was in urgent need. When granted finally, this amounted to fifteen thousand dollars, (with interest), a considerable sum for those days.

There was little to cheer Kosciuszko in the prevailing mood of the new republic. Far from settling down to an enjoyment of its new-won freedoms, he found it torn with bitter dissension over events in France. The Federalists, then in power, even urged the necessity of armed struggle against the French while the Republicans, led by Jefferson, Secretary of State, strongly resisted the tide. The situation was anything but auspicious for the reception of a distinguished visitor from abroad.

Kosciuszko's sympathies, according to the author, were with the Republicans, an allegiance that was undoubtedly costly in terms of forfeited friendships. Kosciuszko regarded Jefferson as his closest friend naming him executor of his will and trustee of his American funds. Although he may have nurtured secret hopes of finding a haven in the new world, the rancor of American political

life and the disturbing events in Poland decided him to return to Europe in 1798. He traveled in secrecy, bearing a special message from Jefferson to French leaders concerning measures deemed advisable to avoid a threatening Franco-American conflict.

Kosciuszko reached Europe too late to be of service to his native land in her ultimate agonies. For a time he planned to return to a fragmented Poland and work for her salvation through the liberal Czar Alexander 1. He sought also to interest the support of Napoleon whose armies included a Polish Legion. These dreams were given final quietus by the Congress of Vienna. A broken and bitterly disappointed man, Kosciuszko retired to Switzerland to spend his declining years, refusing to settle in a Bourbon France.

Even in his own lifetime Kosciuszko came to be regarded by his countrymen as a symbol of Poland's national tragedy and of her enduring hopes for regained nationhood. His personal unhappiness expressed the martyrdom of his people; his frustrations and defeats took on a religious significance. It was inevitable, although perhaps unfortunate, that it was his intense Polish nationalism rather than his impassioned belief in democracy that was to receive the greater emphasis.

In this study based on considerable research Mr. Haiman has carefully avoided the temptation of eulogizing his hero but has rather endeavored to allow his full stature to emerge in all its human deficiencies and failings. While there is no deep probing into the backgrounds of Kosciuszko's democratic faith, one is left with an unforgettable impression of him as a tolerant, noble-spirited and gentle human being who maintained his democratic principles in a world whose sacrosanct feudal order still regarded such notions as "subversive" and "alien."

Written with academic austerity and concentration, Mr. Haiman's study will add considerably to an understanding of one whose name has long been more familiar than the meaning of his life and deeds. An appendix includes exchanges of letters between Kosciuszko and Jefferson. There is an exhaustive bibliography and several reproductions of Kosciuszko's water color and india ink sketches which are published for the first time.

EDWARD FALKOWSKI

Lay My Burden Down: A Folk History of Slavery, edited by B. A. Botkin. University of Chicago Press. 285 pp. \$3.50.

This book, although narrating the point of view of simple folk, is somewhat difficult to appreciate for those who do not know the American South and the heritage of slavery which permeates the region. Nonetheless, it ought to be required reading for anybody who wants to have his say in matters pertaining to the American Negro. Ever since the appearance of Uncle Tom's Cabin, the American reading public has been flooded with books condemning slavery and its aftermath, discrimination. "Race Relations," as the term goes, have been expounded at length in works of fiction and in scholarly volumes by white reactionaries, white liberals, and Negro intellectuals, but the folk-Negro, the real actor in the play, has remained mute. In Mr. Botkin's collective biography, at long last, we have his own story from his own mouth.

The book is based on a selection and integration of excerpts and complete narratives from the Slave Narrative Collection of the Federal Writer's Project, but Mr. Botkin as the folklore editor of the project is chiefly responsible for the compilation. There is a Part One, called "Mother Wit" which reveals the thousand and one devices by means of which a cruelly oppressed people not merely manages to survive but also succeeds in retaining its self-respect. Like many of the stories emanating from the European Ghettos, these devices are funny only in a superficial way. They epitomize the relentless war between the masters and the slaves and approve of any stratagem used in the process. Part Two, called "Long Remembrance," contains typical life histories of ex-slaves, arranged according to regions, and is easily the most readable part of the book. This bears out Vernon Loggin's contention which is quoted in the introduction, namely that "With the exception of his folk-songs, the Negro's most valuable contributions to American literature have been in the form of personal memoirs." Parts Three, Four, and Five are again anecdotal in character. Part Three, under the heading "From Can to Can't," deals mainly with work experiences, including the evasions of work under slavery while Part Four, under the heading "A War Among the White Folks," deals with the experience of liberation,

and Part Five, finally, under the heading "All I Know About Freedom," deals with the reaction to the amazing new life which burst upon the black man after the abolition of slavery. A list of informants and interviewers concludes the volume.

The stories and anecdotes contained in the collection are uneven in value and importance. Some are rather inconsistent and confused, some are full of flattery and exaggeration, some attempt to cover up the better part of truth in the face of what may have appeared as the undue curiosity of outsiders. In short, the entire pattern of Negro adjustment to White society in America, which favors concealment of personal feelings, entered into the project. However, this merely enhances the merits of the enterprise. It is a mighty step toward the exploration of the souls of black folk.

WERNER J. CAHNMAN

The Process of Persuasion, by Clyde R. Miller. Crown Publishers. N. Y. 234 pp. \$2.00.

The author of this book was the founder of the Institute for Propaganda Analysis which flourished during the late 30's. That organization had the laudable purpose of exposing the tricks and devices of propagandists, and performed a public service in sensitizing the public to dishonest persuasion. The Institute's work was not an unmixed blessing, however, because of its own special biases and because of its inadequate definition of propaganda. Its biases were revealed in its insistence, during the interventionist debate, on analyzing the "propaganda" of "war-mongering" pleas to aid the allies in the war against Hitler. On the other hand it ignored the "peace" propagandists such as the America Firsters and other isolationists. Its definition of propaganda was inadequate in that it announced that all forms of motivational language were propaganda of one form or another. This definition encouraged the view that "everything is propaganda." The listener who refuses to believe anything he hears is just as uncritical as the gullible believer and the Institute's work undoubtedly encouraged the refusal of many Americans to be "taken in again" with war-atrocity stories.

Propaganda analysis has not lost the center of attention. In line with the new

interest in language and communication Dr. Miller has turned his attention to "persuasion-analysis:" old wine in new bottles. The Institute had employed seven techniques of propaganda in its analysis. Dr. Miller has reduced these to four types of persuasion techniques: the "Virtue," "Poison," "Testimonial" and "Together" devices.

Dr. Miller's zeal for public service seems to have suffered some deterioration. The wrapper of the book states that it contains "a thorough analysis of devices used by individuals and organizations to sway public opinion. Dr. Miller shows how an individual may use similar devices to gain his ends . . . in his own dealings with people. It is not only a book for speakers, lawyers, salesmen, advertisers and promoters, but for every man, because every man is engaged—whether consciously or unconsciously—in the process of persuasion."

The blurb gives evidence of the divided motives which inspire the author, who is not now exclusively interested in warning his readers against being bamboozled . . . As the blurb indicates, the techniques of persuasion may be used by all of us to gain our ends. If you want to persuade, exude a little poison in the proper places. Since Dr. Miller is a member of the faculty of Teacher's College of Columbia University it appears that the use of Machiavellian techniques of salesmanship in the realm of public opinion has now received the stamp of approval within the walls of a leading educational institution.

In fairness to Dr. Miller it should be said that the book's emphasis is on the need for creative and critical thinking, so that the public may become thinking beings rather than conditioned reactors who automatically respond to the triggers of persuasion. He also notes the useful work being done under the "Springfield Plan," which seeks to analyze prejudice and to eliminate it through group cooperative enterprises and critical thinking.

The wrapper of the book also states that "this book is an answer to those who say 'You can't change human nature.'" Precisely what this phrase means to the author is not wholly clear. On the one hand he cites the advertising campaign of the cigarette manufacturers which made smoking by women an approved social custom as "proof that, if you know

how, you can 'change human nature'" (page 63). But ten pages later, on page 73, we learn that "Human nature being what it is, in Russia as elsewhere, ownership merges with ambition, rivalry, pugnacity and pride."

LIONEL RUBY

Light From The Ancient Past: The Archaeological Background of the Hebrew-Christian Religion: Jack Finegan: Copyright 1947, by Princeton University Press: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press.

Printed in the United States of America by Princeton University Press at Princeton, New Jersey.

Reading this book is like a Christopher Columbus voyage in reverse order, eastward instead of westward, backward instead of forward in time, discovering an old world instead of a new one. However, the first sentence of the preface may be pointing to both the past and the future, to an old world and to a new world: "The purpose of this book is to give a connected account of the archaeological background of the Hebrew-Christian Religion." Archaeology points to the past; does the term "Hebrew-Christian Religion" point to a consummation yet to be realized?

In the five hundred clearly printed pages of this book are to be found two hundred and four illustrations of writings and works of art covering the five and a half milleniums from 5000 B. C. to 500 A. D. The geographical area is Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, Palestine. There, in these now desolate deserts, is the lately discovered old world where civilizations once flourished and will flourish again.

Students of history and of the Bible, Hebrew and Christian, are interested in the records of the past inscribed on clay tablets, carved on stone monuments, written on papyrus, and now revealed by excavations of the "tulul," mounds that mark the sites of ancient and even of modern towns. Here evidences of civilizations, the later built on the piled-up rubbish of the older, tell the story of "the long historical development of which the Hebrew Patriarchs were the heirs." (Page 13) In this book are numerous illustrations of the literary antecedents of the Biblical accounts of Creation, of the

flood, and of the Mosaic legislation, and of the wisdom literature older than the Hebrew. "Abraham himself was the heir to a complex and age-old civilization." (Page 61)

The Panorama of Egypt passes before the reader's eyes with an enthralling interest. Kings, priests, moralists, lawyers, laborers, appear as old acquaintances. "Ideas of the overshadowing care of God, and of ethical demands on earthly life root back here. Actual passages from the wisdom literature of Egypt were taken over by the Hebrew writers. Thus the Psalms, wisdom books, and prophetic works of the Hebrews are connected intimately with Egyptian literature just as the mythology and the law of the Old Testament are related closely to that of Babylonia." (Page 116)

Section III, "The Past in Palestine," attracts specific attention just now, because of the tragic situation in that land. Archaeological discoveries there are having a profound influence on our understanding of the history of the Hebrew people and of the Bible. "Excavations at the site of Jericho indicate that the city walls were destroyed more than once, and "the only solution at present seems to be to admit that the conquest of Canaan did not proceed with quite the swiftness and the uniformity with which it is represented in the book of Joshua but was the result of successive waves of invasion." (Page 136)

Assyrian, Persian, Greek, and Roman influences on Palestinian history are described, together with "Sacred Ways and Sites." There are a number of pages devoted to "The Holy Land in Jesus' Time." After that "The Work of Paul" receives detailed attention. This is followed by a description of ancient writing materials and a vivid recounting of the rescue of ancient manuscripts—Codexes—from ignorant neglect and from their convenience as kindling for monastery fires. There is a story of the Christian Catacombs and Sarcophagi. The last chapter deals with the ancient churches in Rome, Palestine, Syria, Egypt, and Constantinople.

This book deserves the attention of historians as well as all persons who have an intelligent spiritual interest in the background sources and in the future of the Hebrew-Christian religion.

GEORGE H. PARKINSON

The Life of Judah Touro (1775-1854), by Leon Hubner. Jewish Publication Society. Phila. 1946. xc + 192 pp. \$2.00.

Very few people who live in this world are remembered beyond the third or fourth generation. Only a few leave their imprints on the sands of time, the greater number pass into eternal oblivion. Only a few become famous; the greater number pass away unsung.

Usually those who become immortal in the annals of our past are personalities who achieved great fame and recognition in the fields of theology, science, history, philosophy, art, and literature. At times someone in political life gains everlasting remembrance. But very seldom an obscure merchant even though he may have amassed great fortunes. If therefore, one of the latter is remembered by posterity beyond the normal span of memory, it must be attributed to some outstanding quality or contribution that posterity cherishes.

Judah Touro was an ordinary merchant, lived a life of seclusion, shunned publicity, and passed away leaving no heirs. Yet he occupies a glorious and immortal position in the galaxy of American personalities. He gained this immortality because of a single quality which is best expressed in the inscription on his tombstone:

"The last of his name
He inscribed it in the Book of
Philanthropy
To be remembered forever."

In a sense the life of Judah Touro is typical of American civilization. He was born on the eve of the battle of Lexington and Concord in comparatively poor circumstances. His father was the struggling minister of the historic synagogue in Newport, R. I. He was orphaned at a very young age, and was taken care of by his uncle, Moses Michael Hays, in Boston. He fell in love with his cousin Catherine. The rich uncle probably opposed the match. Both never married. Judah went to New Orleans, became a very prosperous merchant and died in 1854, nearly eighty years of age, leaving a will which became a classical document of ethical and charitable testaments.

Judah Touro's life was not picturesque. In fact it lacked the adventurous elements that the most ordinary biography contains, save the one incident of his volun-

teering in the U. S. Army, and serving in the battle of New Orleans, under Jackson, where he was wounded and was saved by his inseparable friend Regis D. Shepherd. Yet, he is remembered because he exemplified the ideal of Jewish charity, which is becoming more and more the foundation of American charity and philanthropy. When the Bunker Hill Monument movement became defunct because of lack of funds, Judah Touro made possible its erection. When a church was put to auction because of debt, he bought it and presented it to the minister and congregation as a donation. When a synagogue, a hospital, an orphan home, any institution for the needy and destitute had to be built, Judah Touro responded with assistance. When Christian Ministers solicited funds for the rebuilding of a Church in Jerusalem that was burned down, he was the largest contributor. When poor Jews needed homes in Palestine, he built them. And so ad infinitum. But in each case he did it not in the spirit of alms-giving, but in the spirit of charity and philanthropy as understood in the Hebrew term *Tsdokoh*—which really means righteousness. *Tsdokoh* knows no bounds, no creed, no color, and no culture. True *Tsdokoh* also shuns publicity—as Touro did—yet receives recognition.

Leon Hubner is therefore to be commended for a genuine attempt to present the life of Judah Touro, to the English reading world. He had very few sources to work with, and yet he has succeeded in producing a fairly comprehensive biography of the American Jewish hero. It is written in an easy style, and makes good reading. The author incorporates in the text fifteen illustrations, which are not only worthy of notice, but which help considerably to make the volume more attractive and valuable. This little volume should be in every Jewish library.

MORRIS A. GUTSTEIN

The American Iliad. The Epic Story of the Civil War as narrated by Eyewitnesses and Contemporaries. By Otto Eisenschiml and Ralph Newman. The Bobbs-Merrill Company. 720 pp. \$5.00.

Of books about the Civil War, there is no end; for the very good reason that there is as great interest today in America's Homeric struggle as there was a

generation ago. Chicago is the center of this interest, with its famous Civil War Round Table, of which the authors and this reviewer are among the co-founders. That group of amateur and professional historians has chewed over every aspect of the war between the States; and the more discussion there has been, the richer have been the results. Book after book appearing in recent years bears the impress of the Civil War Round Table influence. This is one such book and it is undoubtedly the best one. It is likewise undoubtedly one of the best books of its kind that has appeared in our time.

Being a friend and, in a very minor sense, a collaborator of the authors, I would ordinarily hesitate to go overboard in reviewing the book, lest I face the charge of literary log-rolling. But everywhere reviewers, who are strangers to the authors, have exhausted adjectives of praise in a calliope of enthusiasm. There is no reason, therefore, for my inhibiting my admiration for the book.

This book is in form an anthology of more or less contemporary material about the Civil War. Some of the material is familiar; but much of it has heretofore been buried in obscure regimental histories and unfrequented archives and historical niches. Eisenschiml and Newman are to be praised highly for a very discriminating assembling job. But they have done far more than that. Unlike most anthologists, they have not been content to gather a mass of material and to fit it loosely into a book of broad dimensions. They have taken each item and gone through it with the utmost care. If it is too long, they have sheared it. They have eliminated tedious or useless passages. They have blended each contribution into the pattern of the whole book. They have woven a continuous narrative. The stitches and seams are inconspicuous. They have become, in a sense, original authors, rather than editors or anthologists.

This does not mean that they have distorted anything, or taken liberties with their sources. They have not. It means simply that they are not slaves to their sources. They are not pedants. They are live men, and they have prepared a live book. It is good fire-side reading.

Books have been written about the economics, diplomacy, politics, journalism, philosophy, geography of the Civil War;

learned books, profound books, stimulating ones; also dumb, stupid and dull books. This is the story of the war; it is a narrative, rather than an exposition. But it gives one real understanding of the profundities and imponderables. It is a novel, rather than a discursive essay. It is recommended for reading even to those who are more concerned with World War II and World War III than with the internecine battles of the past. For it gives the common denominators of all wars and human nature itself.

ELMER GERTZ

Enchanting Rebel: The Secret of Adah Isaacs Menken, by Allen Lesser. Published by Beechhurst Press. 1947. 273 pp. \$3.50.

Father and The Angels, by William Manners. Published by E. P. Dutton & Co. 1947. 215 pp. \$2.75.

These two volumes represent varied aspects of Jewish life in America. It has often been felt that before any thorough work can be done in writing a history of the Jew in America, it would be necessary to secure more data on eminent personalities, as well as autobiographical sketches, of the people whose lives were definitely a part of American Jewish history.

The first of the books under review is a long needed study of one of the most exotic characters in that history. As one whose name is referred to in any study of the American theatre, who was toasted from coast to coast as the "great Menken," who rode the stage in tights for the first time, Adah Isaacs Menken deserves and has now received a biographical study. Clarifying the matters concerning her origin, which had hitherto been shrouded in fancy and imagination, Lesser handles the theme of her reckless and benevolent nature with delicate care and understanding.

As a regular contributor to *The Israelite* of Cincinnati, which frequently published her poetry on Jewish life, Adah's more poetic than thorough understanding of Judaism identified her with her people. The vicissitudes of her love life make interesting reading in itself, embellished as they are by Lesser's romantic phraseology. To the student of American Jewish history this book throws an interesting light on a minor marginal Jew; a true

descendant of Rachel Levin of the Berlin salons.

The second book under review is an autobiography, in an extraordinary sense of the word. It relates the history of a Jewish Rabbi in Zanesville, Ohio, during the turn of the century, as seen through the eyes of his son. As such, it is an excellent evocation of a period and personality.

To many who have had direct experience with benevolent patriarchs in their own family, this book will provide sufficient opportunity for reminiscence. Its delicate treatment of human relations in a small town, its lusty portrait of a sincere and tolerant figure who was half-Zaddic and half-Mitnagid, results in a picture of American-Jewish small town life that will be an essential part of anyone's library of American Jewish writing. There can be no question of the fact that types like this Rabbi played their definite role in making Jewish life in America the colorful thing that it is. But over and above this historical value, it is a brilliantly told story in itself, and many readers will find in it an opportunity to understand the prototypes of their own acquaintances.

Both of these books, then, although not major works in the strict sense of the word, represent background material that goes to make up the history of a people. There are many more lacunae—a life of Emily Lazarus, a study of Jewish life in the far West—but these two are solid beginnings.

IRVING LEVITAS

Between Fear and Hope, by S. L. Shneiderman. Arco Publishing Co., 316 pp. \$3.75.

Between the years 1939 and 1945, the Germans decimated ten million Poles; of this number more than a third were Jews, who constituted but eight per cent of the Polish population.

Between Fear and Hope is a spirited and a penetrating report upon postwar Poland, by a trained journalist, a former native of Poland who had recently revisited all of the important cities of that country. Mr. Shneiderman's book is a disheartening tale of a stricken people, Poles, many of whom, to this day, carry on burdened by old prejudices and, insofar as the Jewry in their midst is concerned, are set upon, the inhuman task

of finishing Hitler's job, the destruction of Jewry.

Most of the Jewry in Poland today are Polish Jews recently "repatriated" from Soviet Russia; these, together with a few thousand,—remnants of the three and a half millions there before the war—constitute the Jewish population in Poland.

In Mr. Shneiderman's telling there is a tremendous hiatus between the present government of Poland and the people governed; the former is an enlightened, progressive agency, dedicated to the common good of the country, while the latter, in the main, is an inert mass of humanity, illiterate, mediocrally superstitious and not wholly cooperative with the government's policies aimed at the welfare of the people. There persists in Poland a well organized underground which maintains a sustained program of sabotage against the acts of the government. While, as the author maintains, it is obviously financed and directed from abroad, its roots lie in the support of many Poles, in Poland. And that despite the fact that the heads of the state have instituted great land reforms, a grandiose scheme of general education, and a number of laws dealing with the social welfare of the people.

The future of the Polish Jewry—what is left of it—is hopelessly bleak. Postwar Poland harbors no concentration camps and professes no Aryan rot of supremacy. A plague spot of anti-Semitism for hundreds of years before the Hitler miasma enveloped central Europe, Poland today does not want the Jew in its midst. The Poles say so occasionally with an organized pogrom, daily acts of violence against the Jew, and but grudging compliance with government exhortations upon tolerance and equality. After the town of Kielce massacre of nearly a hundred Jews out of a total of one hundred fifty there was a wave of sit-down strikes in the city of Lodz textile factories, protesting the government trial of the murderers.

The powerful Catholic Church of Poland which exerts a tremendous influence upon the population maintains but an attitude of polite disapproval of the treatment of the Jewry. Many of the present citizens of Poland of the Jewish faith dare not parade their own names, but for safety's sake adopted a Polish nomenclature.

The sincerity of the Polish government, according to the author, in its endeavors to extirpate anti-Semitism is unquestioned, but the process of reeducation is, necessarily, a slow one. Mr. Shneiderman sees little hope for a firm reestablishment of the Jew on Polish soil. Neither does the Jew care to remain in a land that is but an expanse of cemeteries where lie his cherished and beloved. Germany's most active crematories were situated in Poland.

Mr. Shneiderman's book is an extremely valuable addition to post-bellum literature. It is definitely indispensable for the understanding of Poland's post-war problems and her future. In its pages there is, also an appraisal of the various forces in that country, fighting each other to gain control of the imagination and confidence of the people and to recreate the country in the image of their ideals for the rebirth of the land.

BENJAMIN WEINTROUB

Proud Destiny, by Lion Feuchtwanger. Translated from the German by Moray Firth. The Viking Press. 625 pp. \$3.50.

I read elsewhere, this is a fine novel, an achievement of the first literary rank, and I paused to wonder, was the other reviewer talking about the same book? Upon further investigation I discovered that it was so. Then, surely, I thought, something must be amiss, for in my estimation *Proud Destiny* is tiresome.

Perhaps, I thought, for I tried to be fair in judging, it is the fault of the translator. But though that may account for the many clichés, the over-burdened sentences and long, clumsy phrasing, he couldn't be blamed for the contents.

"Pierre's lively rounded face, with its clear brow, shrewd, merry eyes over the straight, sharp nose, and full, arched lips, radiated animation." Is this Feuchtwanger's writing?

That which angers me most about "guild selections," and "book-of-the-month club selections," and "best sellers," is the all out whoop-a-loo of getting on the bandwagon and repeatedly shouting the dear, meaningless adjectives—stirring—fine—brilliant!

In these times of disquietude, we need most of all, books that will bring understanding to an apprehensive mankind. Instead, we get *Proud Destiny*, a hash

made so adroitly that thinking critics are hoodwinked into shouting its praises. Here is a concoction of vain men who are writers, of seventy year old men who like to sit in the nude and recall their past erotic adventures, of kings who are half-men, of beautiful queens who are restless, and of ambitious actresses. Here is Paris during 1778 and '79. Here we go to court and meet the King and Queen, the moral brother, the suave doctor, the engaging wooer of the Queen. We get to know Pierre Caron de Beaumarchais whose secret company, by sending munitions, helped win a victory for the American colonies at Saratoga, and who was helpful, because of this victory, in bringing about an alliance between France and America. We get to know tubercular Voltaire come back to Paris to die still defying the church and God, and we see Benjamin Franklin quite often, that popular historical figure who here has little more illuminating to say than, "Without lust, without eroticism, there was no great man imaginable, no statesman, no scholar."

These and many other beguiling, conspiring, witty and ambitious people whisk about. Here is intrigue, romance, love, hate, jealousy, and passion on a broad canvas.

Proud Destiny is diverting, and if you don't mind wading through excessive verbiage to be entertained, it may please you. But it is this reviewer's opinion that it is not fine, stirring, brilliant, and it most certainly is unworthy of the plaudits conferred.

KATHERINE KORNBLAU

Economics of Migration, by Julius Isaac. With an introduction by Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders. Oxford University Press, 1947. 285 pp. \$4.50.

There is no over-abundance of material in the literature dealing with the analysis of great international migrations. Hence, this compact little volume, while not of a pioneering nature, is an important scholarly contribution to the study of the movement of peoples in human history. It is one of a series of the International Library of Sociology and Social Reconstruction, edited by Prof. Karl Mannheim of the University of London. A first version of this study was recently approved as a Ph. D. dissertation by the University of London.

In his brief introduction, Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders, Director of the London School of Economics, sees migration as "a test case in international relations." Such relations, he maintains, can become satisfactory only when the peoples concerned cast off their biased and erroneous views and obtain a better understanding of the economic and sociological problems troubling the world.

Dr. Julius Isaac, the author, presents here a fairly comprehensive discussion of the various problems involved in the mass movements of peoples, particularly the causes and effects of the great international migrations of the last hundred years. He does not attempt to estimate, on the basis of past migrations, the nature and volume of migratory trends to be expected in the future. Such estimates would be impossible at this time when the whole pattern of international relationships is still in the process of being reshaped. Instead, he seeks to learn from past experiences how a resumption of international migration, even if on a limited scale, might prove beneficial towards world reconstruction.

The central theme of the study revolves around the following question: Is it possible to plan migration internationally, with the purpose of achieving a more favorable distribution of population and also encouraging colonization in the more sparsely populated areas of the world? In an effort to find an answer to this question, the author embarks on a study of the political, economic, demographic, and sociological aspects of migration which he considers the major factors determining the volume and direction of mass movements.

In the century between the Napoleonic Wars and World War I approximately fifty million people emigrated from Europe to other parts of the world. During that period freedom of migration, i. e., the right of exit and entry, was practically universal. After the first World War, however, a new epoch began in which the movements of people were impeded by quotas and other restrictions to the point where migration in the period between the two great wars had been reduced to a virtual standstill.

The author stresses in the main the economic aspect of migratory movements, which leads him to the conclusion that the new continents were able to absorb

the millions of Europeans for two reasons: 1) because there was a continual flow of capital exports from Europe which provided the necessary capital equipment for the immigrants in the new countries; 2) because free trade made possible the export of wheat, cotton, wool, and other important agricultural products from these countries to Europe. Thus, there was a constant movement not only of men, but also of money and goods which accounted for the economic readjustments of international dislocations.

As the author reasons it out, there was "a close positive correlation between migration, international capital movements, and international trade." While it may be difficult to determine the relationship among these processes, the fact remains that migration called forth the movement of capital in the same direction and an increase in international trade; capital movements, in turn, provided new incentives to migration and the international exchange of goods; finally, the growth of international trade created greater opportunities for capital investments abroad and for migration. In the years after the first World War there has been a steady decline in all these three processes, with migration suffering the worst blows.

In the years since the end of World War II, most plans dealing with post-war reconstruction emphasize the need for reestablishing international trade and international capital movements, but nearly all completely neglect the problem of migration or at best dismiss it on the grounds that mass migration is undesirable for social and political reasons and that, furthermore, there are no places left which are suitable for large-scale settlement. The author reaches the conclusion that a resumption of international migration of mass proportions such as occurred prior to World War I is, therefore, no longer possible. There will be no return to unrestricted movements of people, and such migration as will take place will be regulated or "planned," as Dr. Isaac prefers to call it. Present conditions of world affairs being what they are, it would be naive to expect that such regulated migration will be objective and unbiased.

It is unlikely that, in this period of planned migration, the United States will liberalize its restrictive immigration policy, but this country could contribute

vastly to the problem of mitigating population pressure in Europe through the promotion of international trade and the granting of loans to both over-populated and sparsely settled countries for development purposes. Among the sparsely populated countries listed by the author are Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and most of the South American countries.

Economics of Migration is a highly valuable contribution to the literature on international migrations, a problem which looms large in the years ahead when the freedom of movement will be sharply curtailed and regulated. It is a serious study of a serious and weighty problem facing the post-war world.

MURRAY FRANK

The Great Wall of China. By Franz Kafka. Translated by Willa and Edwin Muir. New York, Schocken Books. 1946. 315 pp. \$3.00.

Previously published in England, back in 1933, this volume of smaller prose pieces gave rise to one of the early "Kafka waves" in English letters. This is the first American edition of the book, published as a forerunner to a series of Kafka works (novels, stories, diaries, letters) which will appear under the Schocken imprint both in English and in the original German.

The Great Wall of China comprises works written in the last years of the Prague author, between 1917 when he was sick in cold, hungry war-time Prague, and 1924, when he was dying in an Austrian sanatorium. There are four longer stories (all of them more or less fragmentary), fifteen short stories and fables, a collection of aphorisms, and the "Reflection on Sin, Pain, Hope, and the True Way." The introduction by Edwin Muir was written in 1933. It is a competent job though too much influenced by the exclusively mystical interpretation of Kafka by Max Brod, and in parts already somewhat obsolete. The six pages of "Exegetical notes" by Philip Rahv, affixed to the book "in elucidation of the more difficult stories" are an excellent example of saying nothing with many learned words. I strongly advise the publisher to add, in a second edition, twelve pages of notes in elucidation of Mr. Rahv's exegesis.

Some of the stories in this volume, especially the fragmentary "Giant Mole"

and the unfinished "Great Wall of China" will probably be used by a vocal group of Kafka interpreters to bolster their thesis that Kafka is to be explained only from a Kierkegaardian angle. Some other stories, for instance the likewise unfinished "Burrow," will be used by partisans of the Existentialist movement in order to claim Kafka as an honorary member of the *littérature noire* of sheer pessimism and despair. Yet both schools should take into consideration that most of these more or less fragmentary prose pieces were written under the terrible strain of an incurable sickness and in the isolating shadow of death. They therefore offer but a limited key to an overall interpretation of Kafka's artistic personality. His novel *America* and some of the writings published in earlier years of his life show him as a writer very well capable of optimism and endowed with a rich dose of humor, and Max Brod in his illuminating biography paints a portrait of a tragic figure lightened up by human understanding, love for life, and a rare gift of laughing and making others laugh.

Much of the optimistic and humorous in Kafka's personality and work is due to his Bohemian heritage. It is, for instance, little known that Kafka had befriended the great humorist Jaroslav Hasek, the author of the indomitable *Brave Soldier Svejk*. And the (losing) fight put up by the heroes of *The Castle* and *The Trial* for justice and freedom is as much influenced by Jewish as it is by Czech history with its constant yearning for human brotherhood and human dignity.

F. C. WEISKOPF

The Chrysanthemum and The Sword, by Ruth Benedict. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston. 1946. 323 pp. \$3.00.

During World War II the O. W. I. requested Mrs. Benedict to do a study on the people of Japan. Though, it appears, Mrs. Benedict had never been to Japan, she felt, nonetheless, that there were many books and studies extant by those who had been there; that from these things she could glean enough material to provide herself with a means of doing a careful analysis of the Japanese people.

Throughout my stay in the Southwest Pacific, Japan, and for a time in Mexico, I was made peculiarly aware of the oneness of all people. We laugh or we cry over the same comedies or tragedies; we

grow angry and warlike from the same series of events. People, I am convinced, are so much alike, that no one book can be trusted to explain their differences, particularly one not based on actual field work.

Mrs. Benedict attempts to show that the Japanese acts under a set caste system owing duties to one set of people which he expects from another. That the Japanese fears to leave his class, but likes the security of knowing his place in the scheme of things. That the Japanese will go to any lengths to protect his honor and avenge a slur on his name. After reading this book, I feel that there are few things said about the Japanese that one cannot, with equal truth, say about the people of the United States.

The most obviously glaring evil in this book lies in its failure to discuss the economic and material conditions which affect Japanese history and character.

To understand Japanese history and what differences there are in Japanese character—and they are none of them basic—one must first know the following things about that land. The Japanese do not produce enough food to feed seventy millions, but must import or starve. Their agricultural framework operates under a strongly entrenched feudal system, with only 8 percent of the population owning 50 percent of the land, while almost 50 percent of the people own but 9 percent of the land. They have a shortage of all of the basic raw materials; and like England, Japan's whole economic life depends upon foreign trade. The houses of Mitsui, Mitsubishi, Sumitomo, and Yasuda, the leaders of Japanese finance and industry, own one-third of the deposits in private banks (at least they did so before the war), 70 percent of the deposits in all trust companies, and one-third of the total foreign trade. Mrs. Benedict mentions this group about three times, and barely mentions the other economic and political conditions at all.

The Japanese liberal movements must be viewed in terms of firmly entrenched industrialists ruling the government, army, navy, and foreign affairs, fighting constantly to maintain the status quo against a newly risen working class. Industrialization in Japan dates back to the Russian-Japanese war. What labor unions arose as a result of industrialization, were lacking in experience and in

trained leadership. The government has fought a long and successful war against union activity, yet in 1937, the year of the China war, there were 628 strikes in Japan.

The Japanese will make a success of life if the following things are done: The Emperor must go, there must be an agrarian reformation, the monopolies of the industrialist class must be destroyed, the liberal movement must be allowed to develop without interference, and the Japanese must be allowed to bargain for raw materials and for markets in a free trade world.

Mrs. Benedict speaks winningly of the Mac Arthur administration of Japan. But Mac Arthur's record of the past two years is not that of a great reformer. He has killed the Philippine Agrarian movement by putting into power the fascist collaborator Roxas, and by presenting him with a well equipped and well trained army to fight all liberal tendencies among the people of the Philippines. He has fought hard to kill the power of the liberals in Japan and to destroy the labor unions. He recently called off May Day celebrations because of a supposed plot to assassinate him. When he leaves Japan, the industrialists and the landlords of the pre-war era will be left behind to take his place.

ISAAC B. SHAPIRO

The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization, by Elton Mayo. Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University. 1946. 150 pp. \$2.50.

"If our social skills (that is, our ability to secure cooperation between people) had advanced step by step with our technical skills, there would not have been another European war." That is the central theme of Professor Mayo's most recent book, based largely upon twenty years of work in the Division of Industrial Research at Harvard. This conclusion is an extrapolation based upon a series of detailed researches in industrial fatigue, labor turnover, and employee morale and the writings of the psychiatrist Pierre Janet and the sociologists Frederic LePlay and Emile Burkheim. From these sources he arrives at the conclusion that the most important problem facing industrial society is the development of new social skills which permit men to adapt to a changing society with

a minimum of friction and loss of social identifications.

It is a tribute to his intellectual flexibility that Professor Mayo's current views differ markedly from those he held two decades ago. He began his industrial researches addicted to the view that social problems inevitably had to be reduced to individual ones. In his first book, *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization*, first published in 1933 and recently reissued, he had arrived at a social-psychological position where the fallacies of a purely biological analysis of worker fatigue and of the assumption that men were dominated by a purely economic calculus were both painfully evident. In this latest volume, he demonstrates the necessity for the maintenance of a satisfactory level of integration in the group for the individual, and for the development of spontaneous cooperation in order to avoid social frictions. The "rabble hypothesis" which holds men to be isolated individuals acting logically and independently of one another to achieve their goals, is rejected as a mistaken description of human society and a false philosophy.

Professor Mayo draws a distinction between the *established society* of the past and the *adaptive society* of the present. From a social world in which there were social skills which guided one's relations to one's fellows and whose possession guaranteed a secure place in one's world, we have moved to a highly mobile rapidly changing society in which people have lost their security of place and are lacking in the skills of social collaboration.

Evidence for these points is drawn from the work in industrial situations, particularly from the already well-described Western Electric Hawthorne studies, and the researches of Janet, LePlay, and Durkheim. In work situations, the existence of a satisfying group relationship on the job led to high morale by adding meaning to the work, providing a sense of personal importance, and giving the security of established social routines. Turnover was found to be less where such group relations existed. The economic logic of a piece rate system did not work where informal group structures stood in the way. It is therefore necessary that such group structures be taken into account, guided, fostered, and encouraged, and that skills be developed for easing people into such groups.

This analysis is translated from the limited realm of industry to social organization in general. Channels of communication and routines of social interaction must be created; people must be gathered from the loneliness of modern urban society and integrated into groupings which provide the social supports and the significant meanings without which men cannot live.

Though there is much of value in this analysis, the suggested solution and the very framing of the problem have severe weaknesses. From the very beginning, tacit assumptions are made about the rightness and persistence of current economic forms of organization, and the growth of unions in the last fifteen years, with the social functions which they perform for members, in addition to their purely economic role is completely neglected. In the detailed concern with industrial problems, based on a logic of production and profit which in part provide the justification for "humanitarian" measures, basic questions of a changing class structure, of the status of the American ideology of opportunity, self-help, and independence are neglected. The question of which problems can be attributed to industrialization and which to capitalism is not even raised.

At one point he says:

Society . . . is breaking down into groups that show an ever-increasing hostility to each other; irrational hates are taking the place of cooperation. This, historically, has been the precursor of downfall for many valiant civilizations. There is no reason to suppose that our own fate will be otherwise, if we do not state explicitly the problem and struggle to develop a better elite than we can show at present in public, private, or academic life. (p. 119.)

The social skills of which Professor Mayo talks are those of the administrator, particularly the big-business administrator. He would make the businessmen-leaders the elite, conscious of their responsibilities and scientifically molding society to a pattern to provide satisfactions to its members. The implicit assumptions with which he begins blind him to the implications of such a position in our current political struggles.

Professor Mayo provides suggestive and stimulating reading. His conclusions must be taken carefully and warily.

ELY CHINYO

Josephus Daniels, Shirt-Sleeve Diplomat. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1947. 528 pp. \$4.00.

After writing four volumes of an autobiography filled with events of national importance as well as a personal record of a leading country editor who became Wilson's Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels has added a fifth—this time his significant career as the Good Neighbor Ambassador to Mexico during the turbulent Cardenas era. President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who served as Daniel's Assistant Secretary of the Navy, made no mistake in rewarding his old friend, a fighting liberal, with the ambassadorship to revolutionary Mexico.

Strangely enough, both Roosevelt and Daniels forgot in 1933 that by all standards of diplomacy, the new ambassador was a bad choice. He had in 1914 been partly responsible for the American seizure of the Vera Cruz customhouse which had cost 126 Mexican and 19 American lives and antagonized all Mexico. This had been done to prevent the landing of German arms for the dictator Huerta and to enable the heir to the liberal-anticlerical revolution, Carranza, to win power. Nevertheless, Cardenas and Governor Aleman of Vera Cruz, (the present President) not only forgave Daniels, but came to regard him as a sincere friend and a guarantee of New Deal sympathy toward the new Mexico. Daniels, who was a 100% Wilsonian, insisted on a revival of the old Bryan-Wilson Golden Rule diplomacy toward Mexico (despite its costliness in 1914-16), and proved more sympathetic to Mexico's financial difficulties than Cordell Hull and other Administration men, even toning down the Hull protests in the oil expropriation controversy. American Catholics were sometimes outraged by Daniels' slowness in dealing with alleged cases of persecution against the Church, but Daniels insisted on Mexico's right to introduce the principle of separation of Church and State. He did use informal pressure against state governors who were fanatically warring on non-political Catholics as well as the other type. Unlike many of his predeces-

sors, he refused to be a "claims-presser" to such an extent as to interfere with Mexican sovereignty. Readers of the *Forum* will be interested in the sympathetic section on Jewish refugees in Mexico. Daniels took a personal interest in their plight and fought their deportation.

Unfortunately, however, this book shares the weakness of the preceding volumes. It is verbose, too often merely anecdotal, and, for the careful reader of the *New York Times*, not too informative. Nevertheless here is one of the few complete and sympathetic accounts of Mexican relations during a critical era.

HARVEY WISH

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, etc., of THE CHICAGO JEWISH FORUM, published quarterly at Chicago, Illinois, for October 1, 1947. Required by the Act of Congress August 24, 1912.

Before me a notary public, in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared BENJAMIN WEINTROUB, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the owner, editor and publisher of THE CHICAGO JEWISH FORUM, and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations.

That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor and business manager are: Publisher—Benjamin Weintraub, 82 West Washington Street, Chicago 2, Ill. Editor—Benjamin Weintraub. Managing Editor—none. Business Manager—none.

That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning one per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member, must be given.) Benjamin Weintraub, 82 West Washington Street, Chicago 2, Illinois.

There are no bondholders, mortgagees, or other security holders.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 1st day of October, 1947.

(Signed) BENJAMIN WEINTROUB

(Signed) Dolly Anstett, Notary Public.

My Commission Expires August 23rd, 1949.

